WITHDRA

HOPE
INTERNATIONAL
UNIVERSITY
Library · Fullerton, California

230.4 S742s 1930
Speer, Robert E. 1867-1947.
Some living issues

2.5
SPC

SOME LIVING ISSUES

By ROBERT E. SPEER

Some Living Issues
Seeking the Mind of Christ
How to Speak Effectively Without Notes
Race and Race Relations
The Unfinished Task of Foreign Missions
The Gospel and the New World
Some Great Leaders in the World Movements
The Stuff of Manhood
A Young Man's Question
Christ and Life
Men Who Were Found Faithful
The Principles of Jesus
Studies of the Man Paul
Studies of "The Man Christ Jesus"
John's Gospel
The Deity of Christ
Christianity and the Nations
Sir James Ewing. A Biography
Christian Work in South America

S7425
1930

Some Living Issues

By
ROBERT E. SPEER

NEW YORK CHICAGO
Fleming H. Revell Company
LONDON AND EDINBURGH

Copyright, MCMXXX, by
FLEMING H. REVELL COMPANY

New York: 158 Fifth Avenue
Chicago: 851 Cass Street
London: 21 Paternoster Square
Edinburgh: 99 George Street

FOREWORD

HALF of these chapters deal with the Person and the significance of our Lord Jesus Christ and His life and work: the other half with a few practical issues in the life and work of His Church. Some of the chapters were delivered first as addresses and have been allowed to retain their colloquial touch. All of them are intended simply as the word of one Christian believer to his fellow believers—all alike seeking to know the mind of Christ and to do His will. If to any one not yet believing they bring an invitation and open the door, the writer will rejoice with great joy.

R. E. S.

New York,
N. Y.

CONTENTS

I. The Place of Christ in the World Today . 9

II. The Grounds for Belief in the Deity of Christ 30

III. The Son of God is the Son of Man . . . 47

IV. The Virgin Birth 59

V. Why Was Christ Crucified? 71

VI. The Resurrection—the Centre of Christianity 84

VII. The Master and Lord of Life 103

VIII. The Alleged Narrowness of Christianity . 117

IX. The Limits of Tolerance 135

X. The Legitimacy of Prayer 153

XI. The Christian View of Marriage and Divorce 168

XII. The Equality of Women in the Church . . 183

XIII. Christian Ideals of Education 204

XIV. The True and Abiding Basis of Christian Missions 224

XV. Some Recent Criticisms of Foreign Missions 230

XVI. Returning to Jesus 252

Index 278

I

THE PLACE OF CHRIST IN THE WORLD TODAY

THE question which is, or which ought to be, of more concern to us than any other is, How far has Christ as yet come toward the place which He claimed for Himself and which the Church has always claimed for Him in the life and thought of the world? There are, of course, antecedent questions: What place did He claim for Himself? Did He claim what the Church alleges that He claimed and what it has claimed in His behalf, or were later ideas glossed over the simple and humble-minded claimlessness of Jesus? "He did not demand," we are told, "that men should worship Him. He asked only to be followed as a teacher and friend. He did not come to found a religion. He had one and He was eager to have men share it. But it was the religion of Jesus. It was not a religion about Jesus that made Him its object and elevated Him to the place of God to be regarded and worshipped as God. This was the doing of His disciples in later years."

These antecedent questions are not to be brushed aside. At any rate, they were not brushed aside. They have been fairly faced. Historical and Biblical criticism has been busy with them for a hundred years. Doubtless there were some Christians who were afraid of this merciless and impartial examination. They

thought that the historic figure of Jesus and the New Testament records could not rightly be subjected to such an examination, in which the confidences and suppositions and acceptances of faith were ruled out. And perhaps some feared the results of such scrutiny lest it might make old attitudes and assurances no longer possible. But as to this, surely Christians ought to be the first people in the world to welcome truth. If we have believed what we ought not to believe or have failed to believe what we ought to believe, we ought to be and are more anxious to be shown our error than any other people in the world. We are not afraid of truth. We believe that God is the God of truth and that all truth is His truth and that Christ is the Truth. So far from dreading any honest examination of Christ and its results, our complaint is that men will not honestly study Him and accept the consequences of such honest study.

And, as a matter of fact, the issue of the critical reexamination of the last hundred years has been the confirmation of the Church's view of Christ's claims. His Person and the documents recording all that we know about Him have been more thoroughly and relentlessly studied than any other person or documents in history, and the net result has been to bring out the figure of Jesus more authentically than ever and to establish, if that might be, still more securely the historic judgment of the Church regarding His character and significance. No doubt there are those who deny this, but none the less it is true. The ablest and most authoritative of all the critics has explicitly told us so. " Let the plain Bible reader," says Harnack in " Christianity and History," " continue to read his Gospels as he has hitherto read them; for in the end the critic

cannot read them otherwise. What the one regards as their true gist and meaning, the other must acknowledge to be such. . . . This evangelical faith need fear no test that can be applied to it. It can bear a strict and methodical scrutiny of the facts which form its historical foundation; nay, for its own sake it must demand such a scrutiny, for while it has no concern with Pilate's speculative question—what is truth?—yet the knowledge of the truth is assigned as its mission, and there, too, its promise will be fulfilled" (pp. 58, 68).

We are warranted accordingly in passing by these antecedent questions as to the place claimed by the Church for Christ, and in asking how far Christ has as yet come toward this place. It is undoubtedly difficult to answer this question. One's judgments are so easily deflected by one's desires. But we gain nothing by self-deception or by refusing to see facts which are at variance with our wishes. And if Christ is receding from the place we claim for Him, it is well for us to know the truth, however bitter it may be. What are the facts in the matter? Is Christ drawing near to or falling further from His rightful place of supremacy in the life and thought of the world?

Well, the facts clearly appear to justify the view that Christ is more looked up to today throughout the whole world as the supreme moral authority and the ultimate and absolute ethical ideal than ever before in human history. This is certainly true of the non-Christian world. In Moslem thought, for example, while there are no doubt hostile tendencies, there is a growing recognition of Christ's moral supremacy. It is found among the Moslem populace and in the intelligentsia. Several years ago in a Persian village we had a discussion with a group of village Mohammedans,

including a mollah and a sayid, with regard to Shiah Mohammedanism and Christianity. It was all perfectly friendly, and at last we asked as to their impression of the character of Christ. Upon this there was much concern among the Moslems as to their answer. Some of the group at first claimed that Mohammed was unquestionably superior, but at last they all agreed in the statement that, while a claim for the superiority of Mohammed might be made on the basis of the Koran, they were of the opinion that in reality Christ and Mohammed were of equal character. A few years ago the emphatic answer would have been that Christ was inferior. A few years hence Christ will stand alone and Mohammed will be ignored or apologies will be offered for him. Already many intellectuals in the Mohammedan lands are repudiating Mohammed altogether, as in Turkey, or are defending him against the moral indictment which historical criticism increasingly brings against him. This is what Amir Ali Syed does in his able book, "The Spirit of Islam." He seeks to vindicate both Islam and Mohammed from the charges made against them, and unconsciously he surrenders his case in presenting it. For what he seeks to do is to clear Islam from moral defect before the bar of Christianity and Mohammed from moral inferiority before the bar of Christ.

And in Hinduism, Christ was never so honoured for His moral excellence as today. Whatever may have produced the change, the missionaries, the English language, Mr. Gandhi, the Reform Movement in India, or aught else, the change itself is unmistakable. Not many years ago the name of Christ was anathema in Hindu audiences and His moral glory unrecognized. But today a great change has come.

The doctrines both of the Incarnation and of the Atonement are a stumbling-block, the former to Mohammedans and the latter to the Hindus, but the comprehensive spirit of Hinduism is very ready to respect and admire Jesus. "In it (Hinduism) there is room for the worship of all the prophets of the world," says Mr. Gandhi. And, admitted on any terms even though not His own, Christ inevitably asserts His moral supremacy. A generation ago, in spite of all that Keshub Chandra Sen said with courage and love, which yet fell short of full faith with regard to Jesus, the thought of India was cold to Him. The influences which have been at work, however, of which Mr. Gandhi has been one of the strongest, have brought the thought of India to the recognition of Christ's moral authority.

Mr. Gandhi has again and again exalted the authority and moral glory of Christ. It is quite true that he rejects our conception of Christ's Person and nature, but he has ever referred to Him with reverence and, even when he has not mentioned Christ's name or perhaps been at all conscious that his thought was influenced by Christ, he has upheld the ethical ideals and principles which historically owe their vitality to our Lord. In these respects and in a great deal of his moral and social influence, Mr. Gandhi has been a very great and a very righteous force in India.

Indians complain of government action which is not in accord with Christianity. They make this complaint not only because the Government purports to be a Christian government, but also because they are coming to recognize Christ's standard and ideal as the ultimate basis of moral judgment. Mr. Natarajan, one of the leading Indians in Bombay, editor of the

"Indian Social Reformer," once presided over one of Dr. Stanley Jones' meetings on "Jesus Christ and Present Day Problems," and declared, at the close of the lecture, that he entirely agreed that the pressing problems of society can be solved only by acting on the principles of Jesus' life and teachings ("Dnyanodaya," December 22, 1921). The "Bombay Chronicle," a leading nationalist newspaper, in an editorial on December 24, 1921, appealed to the example of Christ in support of the non-cooperation movement. It pictured the attitude which, in its view, Christ would take if He returned to India. It appealed to His authority in support of Mr. Gandhi's policy as embodying "the truths of Christianity and of all religions as applied to politics and statecraft." "The Servant of India," another nationalist paper, in an editorial on cowardice and non-violence, held up before the non-cooperators the example of Christ in His trial: "When Christ was brought before Pilate, His reply to all the latter's impertinent and irreverent questions was a dignified silence. This is a significant indication of how we should meet the insulting outbreak of irresponsible power. We must make it feel —how, only the actual circumstances can suggest— that it is in the wrong."

An Indian Christian, visiting America recently, told of an experience in a railroad train in the Punjab shortly before he left India. In the same railway compartment was a Hindu barrister. The conversation turned on the corruption and chicanery of many Indian lawyers. The Christian spoke of the injury done by such men to Indian society. "Yes," the Hindu replied, "it is an injury and a disgrace. I myself would not think of doing such things. To act in

such a manner would be to behave in a radically un-Christian way." The speaker was no Christian, but he recognized the authority of the Christian ethical ideals.

A Congregational missionary in southern India wrote home some time ago a yet more striking illustration of the new recognition in India of the moral authority of Christ: "The lawyers' club of Madras is composed of university graduates and some of the finest minds in Madras. Recently they had a big dinner followed by an entertainment at which a Hindu jester took part. He jested about the Hindu gods and their escapades, and the audience laughed heartily. Then the jester began to make fun of the Christ. Instantly there was silence, then hisses, and finally the audience rose as one man and kicked the jester from the room. Yet there was not a single Christian in that audience. They had no respect for their own gods, but they had for Jesus."

Perhaps it is easy to overdo this emphasis on the wider recognition of the moral authority of Christ. Perhaps in Japan and China there is not so great evidence of such recognition and acceptance. And here in the West there are wide currents of thought and feeling which have rebelled against and rejected the moral standards of Christianity and Jesus Christ Himself as the ultimate ethical ideal. But these are back eddies. The main stream sweeps steadily on to a world-wide acknowledgment of Jesus as moral Lord. With all that has been disturbing in the attitude of some groups of students toward Christianity since the War, it has been significant to note the great acceptance of the finality of Christ's moral judgments. On questions of race, industry, war, nationalism—if any course of policy or action could be shown to be

contrary to the mind of Christ, that was sufficient to condemn it, and it was enough to prove, in favour of any course, that it was what Christ would approve. In spite of all the trends of opinion and attitude which seek to break away from the authority of the ethics of Christ, the minds of men turn more and more to these moral conceptions as their only hope. Some turn in despair, but others in joy and eagerness. And it is certainly in accord with the facts of the world's life and thought today to say that Christ is nearer His place as the supreme moral Master and Lord of men than ever before. He is far enough still from this place in the matter of the actual submission of the world's will to His mind, but, theoretically at least, His moral authority is more recognized than ever as the ultimate ideal of right.

But this was only part of Christ's claim. It was assuredly a part of it. "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father who is in heaven." "And why call ye me, Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say? Every one that cometh unto me, and heareth my words, and doeth them, I will show you to whom he is like: he is like a man building a house, who digged and went deep, and laid a foundation upon the rock: and when a flood arose, the stream brake against that house, and could not shake it: because it had been well builded. But he that heareth, and doeth not, is like a man that built a house upon the earth without a foundation; against which the stream brake, and straightway it fell in; and the ruin of that house was great."

But Christ's claim went far beyond this. He claimed to be not the moral Lord of life alone, but

the unique Son of God. The evidence for the view that Jesus made this claim for Himself may be considered later. It is sufficient here to recall that the Church has always made it for Him. The New Testament bears throughout the impress of this conception. It is in Matthew's record of Peter's confession: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." It is in the title to Mark's Gospel, "The Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God," and in his report of the confession of the unclean spirits, "Thou art the Son of God." It is in Luke's account of the Annunciation, "This holy thing which is begotten shall be called the Son of God." And John's Gospel is full of the faith in Christ's deity. The book was written in the interest of that faith: "These are written that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God, and that believing ye may have life in his name." And no word more clearly shows the claim of the early Church than the verse in the account of the Ethiopian Eunuch's conversion, which is omitted in the Revised Version and inserted as a footnote: "And Philip said, if thou believest with all thy heart, thou mayest. And he answered, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." And Paul's profoundest and most earnestly avowed faith is the same: "I live by the faith of the Son of God who loved me and gave himself for me." These are but fragments of the proof that the claim made for Christ is a claim not alone for the acceptance of His moral supremacy, but also for the recognition of His deity.

And what does the world think of that claim? Is it any way at all disposed to allow Christ the place of deity in its life and thought? Well, once again it is significant to note the change which has taken place in the

attitude of men in the non-Christian faiths. An English friend in India has collected from Dr. Stanley Jones' experiences, and from his own, a list of acknowledgments which might be indefinitely extended:

A Hindu Professor of Modern History (South India):

"My study of modern history has shown me that there is a Moral Pivot in the world, and that more and more the best life of East and West is revolving about that Pivot; that Pivot is Jesus Christ."

A Hindu Professor (Allahabad):

"The thing that strikes me about Jesus Christ is His imaginative sympathy. He seemed to enter into the experiences of men and feel with them. He could feel the darkness of the blind, the leprosy of the leper, the degradation of the poor, the loneliness of the rich, and the guilt of the sinner. And who shall we say that He is? He called Himself the Son of Man, He also called Himself the Son of God. We must leave it at that."

The Editor, "Indian Social Reformer:"

"The solution of the problems of the day depends upon the application of the spirit and mind of Jesus to those problems."

A Hindu judge:

"If to be a Christian is to be like Jesus Christ, I hope that we will all be Christians in our lives."

A Hindu Professor (North India):

"Jesus Christ is the best character that has appeared in human history. No other such Personality has ever appeared in our world."

A Mohammedan Judge (North India):

"Jesus is as near being God as is possible to be. In the truest sense He is the Son of God."

A Brahmo Samajist:

"There is no one else seriously bidding for the heart of the world except Jesus Christ. There is no one else on the field."

A Parsee Principal to Hindu students:

"Now that we are going to get self-government, are we ready for it? Have we enough of the spirit of self-sacrifice? In order to get it, it would be well to study and follow the example of Jesus Christ, for He is supreme in self-sacrifice."

Mr. Gandhi:

"The great example of history exemplifying all that I imply by non-cooperation with evil, is Christ."

Mr. Nararajan:

"It is curious that while it [*i. e.*, Mr. Gandhi's arrest] has shaken the faith of some people . . . in the efficacy of morality and non-violence as a political method, it has prompted a much larger number, including several who had set themselves for years to counteract the proselytizing work of Christian missions to turn to the figure of Christ upon the Cross in reverent contemplation. Orthodox Hindus, militant Arya Samajists, devout Mohammedans and, of course, Brahmos have had their minds turned to Calvary in commenting upon the event. It may be said without exaggeration that the Mahatma in jail has achieved in a short while what Christian missions had not in

a hundred years, with all their resources of men and money—he has turned India's face to Christ upon the Cross."

Many of these quotations look back to the ethical conception of Christ which we first considered, but many of them pass beyond this to the thought of Christ as the unique Son of God. No doubt it is easy to make too much of such declarations. Many men make them who are unprepared to act as their words would indicate that they ought. But it is certainly true that increasingly in the non-Christian nations the very issue of theism itself is becoming identified with the problem of Christ. We asked a group of able Chinese students in one of the greatest of China's universities how Christians might best present Christianity to the Buddhist mind of China? "You need not bother about that question at all, as far as we are concerned," they replied. "We are supposed to be Chinese Buddhists, but Buddhism has no interest for us at all. The one issue which has life in it for Chinese students today is Agnosticism or Christianity."

In one sense, no doubt, it is harder for men to believe today than in earlier days in the possibility of the Incarnation, that God could have had a Son who came in human flesh and lived among men. But why should it be harder? Because, it is replied, we realize now the immensity of the universe, as our fathers did not, and the absurdity of the idea that the Creator of the universe, if there be a Creator, would come as a man to one of the tiny motes of this universe which is our world and live and die here as a man. But size or bulk is of no relevance in the

matter at all. Modern philosophers are prepared to concede the human spirit to be greater than all material things whatsoever. And the Incarnation is only absurd on an absurd hypothesis as to the character of God and the worth of man. If Christ be the measure of God, it is not absurd that God should have stooped from heaven, and if Christ be the measure of man, it is not absurd that God should have stooped to earth.

And as offsetting the crude difficulty arising from the intimidating bigness of the universe there are other ideas of our time which have helped many minds toward faith in the Incarnation—such as the ideas of development and personality. Dr. George Gordon speaks of these in "The Christ of Today."

"Assume that the consciousness of Christ represents the consciousness of God, and we rise to the true level. Here is the human race toiling up the long ascent from brutehood, living through the unrecorded ages a life of inconceivable struggle; it emerges into history, and becomes able to record its sufferings because they have been reduced to manageable compass. Next come the vast empires of force, and under them the conviction is born that existence is vain. At a given point of time, not without the noblest preparations, One appears who represents the mind of the Eternal. The whole scene is changed. Suffering then becomes the revealer of the path of life, and the impulse to walk therein; the unrecorded ages of labour and sorrow are converted into a sublime assent of mankind in response to the Divine election; the long and tragic drama of history takes the form of an evolution of the purpose of God in the education of humanity. The advent of Christ as the accredited representative of the Infinite thus makes unmistakable the august significance of life. The movement of mankind remains wild and terrible, but a purpose is seen subduing it. The path of progress is still an agony and a

bloody sweat, but there is no waste; every ounce of pain, every hour of darkness, is made to contribute to the mighty advance, serves to bring out the glory of the receding goal, and is converted into richer and vaster being on the way. The Christian conception of the Incarnation, clearly understood, constantly entertained, and allowed free play over imagination and feeling, will utterly annihilate all opposing forms of thought, and create an optimism that nothing can exhaust. No philosophy at war with human interests can as much as gain a foothold in a mind and a community under the ascendency of the consciousness of Christ as the consciousness of God. To such a mind and community, such a philosophy becomes incredible and inconceivable. This is part of the meaning of the profound apostolic resolve to preach Christ. It is to employ, in behalf of the world that works and suffers, that has no time and no talent for abstract thinking, an engine of power that will never allow even an invasion of the great and beautiful expanses of faith.

" Upon Christ the human race must ever be dependent. In the last analysis, the reason of this is that Christ is not something external to humanity, but first the true Incarnation of its eternal prototype in the Godhead, and second, the very divinity with which its spirit is consubstantiated. The coming of Christ means the awakening of humanity to its ideal and divine side; and His departure would signify the abandonment by the race of sonship to the Father in heaven. The rejection of Christ is the expulsion of the divine from human thought and concern, the disowning of all the ties that bind this earthly existence to the Infinite, the degradation of life to the animal level, and the rigid confinement of all its activities and interests within the godless and soulless categories of sense and time. Humanity thus stands or falls with the acceptance or rejection of its King. The Christ, universally disowned by life as well as by thought, would be a humanity dead; while the Christ universally received would be humanity lifted to the summit

of its privilege, and in the happy realization of the end for which it was created.

"The true relation of mankind to the Lord Jesus is not grasped until He is regarded as the Incarnation of the Eternal Humanity in which the race is constituted. . . . A race under the delusion of practical atheism, with the living God unrecognized and standing outside the circle of its interests, a humanity under the horrible dream that it has no Father in heaven, can never be a conquering humanity. On the other hand, I can imagine nothing better or sublimer for man than profound and vital surrender to the Personality that rules all worlds, than the education that comes through the habitual sense of God, than the impulse toward social good, and the desire and power to bless other lives, that must issue where the spirit stands in the clear and reverent consciousness of the Infinite truth and grace. The moral personality of God is the resource of our race in its sin, and ignorance, and weakness, and sorrow; when it looks toward that it begins to hope, when it builds upon that it begins to achieve and live. The question of all questions, I repeat, must ever concern the larger introduction of God to mankind, the resting and renewing of mankind in the love of the Eternal. Philosophy and history come to our aid here. Philosophy proves that the moral power of God can be mediated only through the living personality of man, and history declares that the personality of the Divine Man is the sovereign and indispensable manifestation of God to the world. If the modern pulpit wishes to bring men to God, it must first of all bring them to Christ; for the widest outlook over the records of humanity's long and sad struggle, and the deepest insight, join in support of the assertion that there is none other name given among men under heaven whereby the educational power of the Infinite is brought, in boundless measure and resistless form, to bear upon the whole human character."

One makes bold to believe that, strong as the con-

trary forces are, nevertheless the tide sets toward some such more adequate recognition of Christ as the true meaning of man and the true revealing of God.

But the Church's claim for Christ has involved not only His moral authority and His Deity, but also His Saviourhood. "The Father sent the Son to be the saviour of the world." Has our world today the slightest interest in the idea of salvation? We are told that the very conception of sin is now meaningless, that no one is concerned over the saving of his soul, and that even if one were concerned he could get no help from another, that no one else can aid him by suffering for him or supplying him with a character which he must achieve for himself. Sin and salvation are declared to be anachronisms left over from a day of personalistic pietism and meaningless for a time which thinks of individuals only in social relationships.

But are we so sure that the Church has not thought of the social aspects of religion before today? Paul's Epistles are assuredly aware of them, and the history of the early Church and of the Church of the Reformation are full of them, and, indeed, one interpretation of the Reformation is that it was a revolt against an overinstitutionalization of religion which sacrificed the individual to the supposed group interest and claim. And when the Westminster Assembly drafted its definition of sin it certainly included all that any true social view requires. "Sin is any want of conformity unto or any transgression of the law of God." Whatever frustrates God's plan for human life and the world, whatever hinders the doing of His will and the coming of His kingdom on earth, even as it is in

heaven, is sin. This was the view of the fathers, and it included both the individual and society.

And are we so sure that sin is an alien notion to the new generation? Does it have no sense of failure, of unsatisfaction, no feeling that life has missed its mark (which is the etymology of the word sin in the New Testament), and is empty and poor? No doubt the sense of sin as an offense against God is inadequate. It never has been adequate. It never can be. The Cross is the measure of such offense, and our experience of the Cross will always be inadequate. But sin as frustration, as dismal failure, as hopelessness, as emptiness of life, as bondage,—is as great a reality and in innumerable lives as bitter an experience as ever.

Even so, but does all this lead men today to turn to Christ as Saviour and Redeemer? Is He any nearer His rightful place in these regards in the life and thought of the world? Well, there are students of the world's life in other religions who see no other Saviour from race discord and division. I once asked Sir Narayan Chandavarkar, of Bombay, what solution of the race problem he could see. He was, at the time of his death in 1923, the leading Indian in eastern India. He had been Judge of the High Council in Bombay, Vice-Chancellor of the University of Bombay, and he was at the time President of the Bombay Legislative Council. He was a member of the Prarthana Samaj, the most progressive of the Indian reform societies within Hinduism, and a great devotee of the poet Tukaram. But he had strong intellectual and spiritual sympathies with Christianity. In one confession he declared:

"I am a Hindu, but I believe in Christ as the highest

fulfilment of Hinduism. I have a picture of Christ crucified in my bedroom, where I can look daily upon it. . . . I believe Jesus Christ to be unique in His character, His teaching, His power to save and help men, and especially in His dynamic and world-wide social programme. No one else ever did for suffering, oppressed humanity what He did. I am a Christian already, yet I cannot dogmatically say that Christ was God. Though a follower of Christ in my daily life, I do not take the outward step of baptism because, as at present interpreted in the popular mind, it means not only to accept Christianity but to reject and denounce Hinduism. This I cannot do, for I believe that God has been in our past history and revelation."

And some years ago, in an address entitled, "The Kingdom of Christ and the Spirit of the Age," he said:

"Let me tell you what I consider the greatest miracle of the present day. It is this: that to this great country, with its three hundred million of people, there should come from a little island, unknown by name even to our forefathers, many thousand miles distant from our shores, and with a population of but fifty or sixty millions, a message so full of spirit and life as the Gospel of Christ. This, surely, is a miracle if ever there was one. And this message has not only come, but it is finding a response in our hearts. The process of the conversion of India to Christ may not be going on as rapidly as you hope, or in exactly the same manner as you hope, but, nevertheless, India is being converted; the ideas that lie at the heart of the Gospel are slowly but surely permeating every part of Hindu society, and modifying every phase of Hindu thought."

In reply to the direct question: "What do you conceive to be the right solution of race problems," he wrote:

" The right solution of the race problem will come if the age realizes the value of the conclusions arrived at in 1920 by the Conference, held at Lambeth, and composed of two hundred and fifty-three Bishops of the Anglican Church. In the report issued by the Conference they say that experience has shown that the doctrine that the best possible condition of society as a whole is that in which different individuals, sections, interests or classes pursue their own self-interest is absolutely false; and that nothing less than a fundamental change in the spirit and working of our economic life is necessary. And they remark: ' This change can only be effected by accepting as the basis of industrial relations the principle of co-operation in service for the common good, in place of unrestricted competition for private profit. . . . As God is our Father and as the Eternal Son of God took our whole human nature upon Him, every son and daughter of God is of infinite and equal value. There are wide differences in capacity, but such differences do not warrant any loss of liberty or failure to give to the children of God the opportunity of a full human life.'

" In this alone lies the right solution of the race problem."

And so also of the problem of war. Some say that only economic considerations will ever end it, but others allege that economic causes are the one supreme source of war and the dominating forces in all life and history. Some say that the horrors of war can be escaped only by making war still more horrible. But that is said before each war more horrible than the last. These are not the ways out. An able American army officer said this some years ago to a small group to whom he unburdened his heavy heart. He had gone to Europe among the first American representatives in the World War and had come back among the last, having been left to help in the final clearance. To a little company of friends he told his

full experience and described the conditions, which he knew as few men in the world knew them. When he finished, one of the group remarked, amid the common gloom, "Well, Colonel, from what you have said, I judge that you are absolutely hopeless of any solution." "No," he replied, "I will not say that. A year ago I would have said so, but not now. I am half ashamed to tell you why. When I went over, I had never read a word in the Bible, but toward the last I had a great deal of time on my hands, and I came upon a Bible. I read it, and I read the Gospels over and over again. And now if you ask me, I will say, Yes, there is one way out, and only one. If we follow the way of Jesus we can get out of this, and if we will not follow it, we will never get out till the end of time." Colonel Watterson, before his death, said the same word: "The future looks black enough, yet it holds a hope. One power, and one alone, can arrest the descent and save us. That is the Christian religion. Democracy is but a side issue. The paramount issue underlying the issue of democracy is the religion of Christ and Him crucified. If the world is to be saved from destruction, physical no less than spiritual destruction, it will be saved alone by the Christian religion. That eliminated, leaves the world to eternal war."

Again let it be conceded that these are but individual voices and that there are other voices which declare that the Christian episode is nearly over and that some new Leader, one among us, or the collective Leadership of a new brotherhood, must come. And it is clear, too, that many want a social Saviour who have no sense of need of a Saviour of each man from the sin of disseverance from the holiness of God. But even so,

and beyond all strife over names, new and old, the Christian conscience and judgment believe that they can see the evidence of Christ's steady advance toward His sovereignty as moral ideal, as Son of God, as Saviour of mankind. We read that the Father sent His Son to be not the loser of the world, but its Saviour, and we are assured that whatever the sources of resistance, and the weight of inertia and the delay of obedience, "there will come a day," as Sir Oliver Lodge is reported to have said, "when human intercourse will be saturated with love and when the mind of Christ will be realized and supreme."

II

THE GROUNDS FOR BELIEF IN THE DEITY OF CHRIST

IT is interesting to note the different grounds on which various types of mind and experience rest their conviction regarding Christ and the distinction which attaches to Him, and to compare these with the ground of Paul's faith. It is of all the more interest to make this comparison because, in Paul's case, the view which he had come to hold with such tenacity, and which he did more than any other man who has ever lived to spread over the world and to fix in human thought for all time, represented a radical reversal of all his previous attitude and conviction. He had been the most outspoken enemy of Christianity, prepared to take responsibility for the slaughter of its advocates, as in Stephen's case, and energetic in his aggressive measures to ferret out its adherents and bring them to punishment. In this endeavour he showed himself a relentlessly honest and a fervently religious man. In later years, when he looked back sadly and regretfully over his young manhood, he nevertheless said that he had acted conscientiously (Acts xxiii, 1; II Tim. i, 3) and from a sense of religious duty. "I verily thought with myself, that I ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth. Which thing I also did in Jerusalem: and many of the saints did I shut up in prison,

having received authority from the chief priests; and when they were put to death, I gave my voice against them. And I punished them oft in every synagogue, and compelled them to blaspheme; and being exceedingly mad against them, I persecuted them even unto strange cities." When such a man, able, clear-minded and courageous, alters his whole position, breaks with old associations and public courses of action, and joins with groups and opinions which he had previously resisted and despised, we are curious to know what it was that led to such a revolutionary change. Paul had utterly disbelieved in the Christians' view of Jesus, and had done his best to destroy the new sect. Now he accepted that view, joined the sect which he had despised, and became the greatest defender and propagator of Christianity. What led to the change? On what fundamental basis of conviction did his new view of Jesus Christ as the Son of God, rest?

To many men, the strongest argument for the deity of Christ is found in the inimitable uniqueness of His character. Horace Bushnell sets forth this argument, more powerfully than it has ever been stated by any one else, in his book, "Nature and the Supernatural," in the chapter entitled, "The Character of Jesus Forbids His Possible Classification with Men." No nobler essay than this has ever been written, and to many minds Bushnell's argument has been either the beginning or the absolute confirmation of their faith. It is worth while to reproduce the outline of it as embodied in Bushnell's own abstract: "The superhuman personality of Christ is fully attested by His character. And the description verifies itself. Represented as beginning with a perfect childhood. Which childhood is described naturally and without exagger-

ations of fancy. Represented always as an innocent being, yet with no loss of force. His purity is unrepentant, yet successfully maintained. He united characters which men are never able to unite perfectly. His amazing pretensions are sustained so as never even to shock the sceptic. Excels as truly in the passive virtues. Bears the common trials in a faultless manner of patience. His passion, as regards the time and the intensity, is not human. His undertaking to organize on earth a Kingdom of God is superhuman. His plan is universal in time. He takes rank with the poor, and begins with them for His material. Becoming the head, then, of a class, He never awakens a partisan feeling. His teachings are perfectly original and independent. He teaches by no human or philosophic methods. He never runs to catch the assent of multitudes. He is comprehensive in the widest sense. He is perfectly clear of superstition in a superstitious age. He is no liberal, yet shows a perfect charity. The simplicity of His teaching is perfect. His morality is not artificial or artistic. He is never anxious for His success. He impresses His superiority and His real greatness the more deeply the more familiarly He is known. Did any such character exist, or is it a myth or a human invention? Is the character sinless? Mr. Parker and Mr. Hennel think Him imperfect. Answer of Milton to one of their accusations. How great a matter that one such character has lived in our world." Bushnell deals with each of these points in a way that has convinced and established many whose minds were in doubt as to the central claim of Christianity regarding the Person of Christ.

In a very different but hardly less effective way

Baron Von Hugel sets forth the same thought in " The Mystical Element in Religion ":

" For a Person came, and lived and loved, and did and taught, and died and rose again, and lives on by His Power and His Spirit for ever within us and amongst us, so unspeakably rich and yet so simple, so sublime and yet so homely, so divinely above us precisely in being so divinely near,—that His character and teaching require, for an ever fuller yet never complete understanding, the varying study, and different experiments and applications, embodiments and unrollings of all the races and civilizations, of all the individual and corporate, the simultaneous and successive experiences of the human race to the end of time. If there is nothing shifting or fitful or changing about Him, there are everywhere energy and expansion, thought and emotion, effort and experience, joy and sorrow, loneliness and conflict, interior trial and triumph, exterior defeat and supplantation: particular affections, particular humiliations, homely labour, a homely heroism, greatness throughout in littleness. And in Him, for the first and last time, we find an insight so unique, a Personality so strong and supreme, as to teach us, once for all, the true attitude towards suffering.

" Not one of the philosophers or systems before Him had effectually escaped falling either into pessimism, seeing the end of life as trouble and weariness, and seeking to escape from it into some aloofness or some Nirvana; or into optimism, ignoring or explaining away the suffering and trial which, as our first experience and as our last, surround us on every side. But with Him, and alone with Him and those who still learn and live from and by Him, there is the union of the clearest, keenest sense of all the mysterious depth and breadth and length and height of human sadness, suffering and sin, *and* in spite of this and through this and at the end of this, a note of conquest and of triumphant joy.

"And here, as elsewhere in Christianity, this is achieved

not by some artificial, facile juxtaposition: but the soul is allowed to sob itself out: and all this its pain gets fully faced and willed, gets taken up into the conscious life. Suffering thus becomes the highest form of action, a divinely potent means of satisfaction, recovery, and enlargement for the soul,—the soul with its mysteriously great consciousness of pettiness and sin, and its immense capacity for joy in self-donation.

"And again, His moral and spiritual idealism, whilst indefinitely higher than that of any of the philosophers or prophets before Him, has nothing strained or restless, nothing rootless or quietistic, nothing querulous or disdainful, or of caste or sect about it: the humblest manual labour, the simplest of the human relations, the universal elemental faculties of man as man, are all entered into and developed, are all hallowed in smallest detail, and step by step.

"And finally His teaching, His life, are all positive, all constructive, and come into conflict only with worldly indifference and bad faith. No teacher before Him or since, but requires, if we would not be led astray by him, that we should make some allowances, in his character and doctrine, for certain inevitable reactions, and consequent narrowness and contrariness. Especially is this true of religious teachers and reformers, and generally in exact proportion to the intensity of their fervour. But in Him there is no reaction, no negation, no fierceness, of a kind to deflect His teaching from its immanent, self-consistent trend. His very apostles can ask Him to call down fire from heaven upon the unbelieving Samaritans; they can use the sword against one of those come out to apprehend Him. But He rebukes them; He orders Peter to put back the sword in its scabbard; and He bids the little ones to come unto Him, since of such is the Kingdom of Heaven. Indeed, St. Mark's Gospel tells us how the disciples begged Him to forbid a man who did not follow them from casting out devils in His name, and how He refused to do so, and

laid down the great universal rule of all-embracing generosity: 'He that is not against us, is for us.'"

And to many other men of powerful intelligence, like Bushnell and Von Hugel, Jesus' character has been a ground of judgment suggesting His unique and unduplicated originality. An extraordinary presentation of this kind appeared in "Ecce Homo" many years ago, published anonymously but written, as it later appeared, by Sir John R. Seeley, Professor of History at Cambridge. John Morley thinks "Ecce Homo" was not a very effective or deeply influential book. But others would differ from this judgment. The book did not satisfy the orthodox view, but it satisfied still less the men who were turning away from Christianity. As Mr. Gladstone said, it constituted "a grave offense in the eyes of those to whom the chequered but yet imposing fabric of actual Christianity, still casting its majestic light and shadow over the whole civilized world, is a rank eyesore and an intolerable offense" (Morley's "Life of Gladstone," Vol. II, p. 166). Far removed today from the controversies which the book aroused, and quite able to note its deficiencies, we appreciate its remarkable description of elements in the character of Jesus which are absolutely unique and unduplicated. When justly and understandingly apprehended, this character, by itself, seems to many minds to require a belief in Christ's divinity.

And there is a stringent compulsion in this argument. For, with us, character is not an irresponsible endowment but a responsible achievement. It is not like genius, which is a gift. If, therefore, we deem the character of Jesus only human, we are bound

under a moral constraint to equal or even to surpass it. How does it come that this has never been done? On any theory of the purely human character of Jesus, men of later generations ought to have surpassed Him. And why do no men surpass Him today? With all our modern resources and advantages, and our faith in evolutionary ethics and indefinite human progress, how is it that no man today can exhibit a character worthy even of comparison with the character of Christ?

Now, Paul was very close to this amazing character. He was himself a specialist in character. A good part of his Epistles is taken up with descriptions of character and appeals for character and suggestions for growth in character. Ultimate likeness to the character of Christ was a goal of life to him. One would have thought that he would have found in Christ's character a most powerful argument of the kind exactly adapted to his own fashion of thought and effective in his apologetic preaching to the mind of his time. But it is not so. There are the scantiest references in his writings to the lineaments of the character of Jesus, and he does not mention it in setting forth the ground on which his faith in the deity of Christ is based. In one of the greatest passages in one of his letters, the first chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, he states explicitly and definitely what that ground was. It was not the character of Christ. That is a convincing argument to us, but Paul had a better one.

Another consideration which is of conclusive force to many minds is Christ's unique character and message as a teacher. This deeply impressed His contemporaries. "The multitudes were astonished at

his teaching; for he taught them as one having authority." "And the officers (of the Sanhedrin) said, Never man so spake." And the wise folk of the Temple were no less impressed. "How knoweth this man letters, having never learned?" And this deeply impresses us still and convinces many of us that Jesus was not a merely human teacher. Both the substance and the method of His teaching were beyond our human achievement. He knew things about God and man which men did not know. His knowledge of values alone has given Him for many minds the value of God. He Himself accounted for the content of His message by advancing a claim to classification above men. "It is the spirit that giveth life; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I have spoken unto you are spirit, and are life." "I have many things to speak and to judge concerning you: howbeit he that sent me is true; and the things which I heard from him, these speak I unto the world." "Jesus therefore said, when ye have lifted up the Son of man, then shall ye know that I am he, and that I do nothing of myself, but as the Father taught me, I speak these things." "I speak the things which I have seen with my Father: and ye also do the things which ye heard from your father." "For I spake not from myself; but the Father that sent me, he hath given me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak. And I know that his commandment is life eternal: the things therefore which I speak, even as the Father hath said unto me, so I speak." "Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me? The words that I say unto you I speak not from myself: but the Father abiding in me doeth his works."

And the method of His teaching was as marvellous as its substance. Let any human teacher be set in full and complete comparison with Christ, and the difference appears at once as a difference not of degree only but of kind. In His power of adaptation, of perfect adjustment of instruction to the expanding capacity of the learners, of symbol and illustration, of proportion and presentation of fundamental principle, Christ as a teacher has had no equal, and will have none.

Now, surely Paul might have found here the sound basis for his belief in Christ's deity. He himself was a teacher, and he was teaching the Gospel of Christ. He constantly lays emphasis on the glory and duty of teaching. We should not have been surprised if he had declared that in his view Christ was divine because only a divine Master could have taught what and as Christ taught. But Paul nowhere speaks of Jesus as a teacher. The nearest he comes to it is in Ephesians. "Ye did not so learn Christ; if so be that ye heard him and were taught in him, even as truth is in Jesus." It was not the unique quality of Christ as a teacher that Paul singles out as the supreme argument for His deity.

Nor was it the miracle of Christ's spiritual consciousness, His sense of perfect harmony with God and the absence in Him of all the division and conflict of personality which so besets and baffles every one of us. This is our modern problem. In one sense it has been the age-old problem of man—the issue of the divided will, of the two natures at war within each of us, the sense in the best of men of an inner isolation from the calm centre of life and the holy purity of God. "The standard of obligation," says Dr. Forrest, in "The Christ of History and Experience," in the

opening chapter on "The Uniqueness of Christ's Moral Self-Consciousness," "may, as with the Christian, be found in the perfection of God, or as with the Positivist, in the constitution of human nature itself, but in both cases the demand which it makes of them, the law which it prescribes, 'Die to self that you may live,' is infinite. This moral consciousness inevitably bears a double witness. The more it assures them of an increasing harmony with the ideal of self-sacrifice, the more it accents also their divergence from it. The harmony and the divergence are two permanent sides of the one spiritual experience. Yet He who has awaked men to this ideal, and for whom it existed in its ultimate and most imperative form, has the sense of harmony without the divergence; that is, He was free from an element which exists universally in the religious life, and through which that life as we know it is built up." He was free from any congenital burden of limitation on the soul. No past in His early life dogged His later moral effort. He never leaned on others, either their knowledge or their prayer. In His dealings with others He was "touched by no such hesitancies as are inevitable in ours." "He comes to each new duty untrammelled by any rebuking memories," as Dr. Forrest says, "and the problems of casuistry have no meaning for Him. In all the diversity of His relations with men He addresses each with the same unwavering note of authority. That He is able to do so implies at the very least that He is conscious He has never deflected at any point from the line prescribed, has taken each stage as it came and got out of it all that the Father meant Him to get; and so He confronts the present with an undimmed confidence. It is not the victory of a soul that selects care-

fully from conflicting courses, but of one that walks right onward in the security of a divine communion. Thus He who has widened to infinity the bounds of personal obligation and intensified in men the abiding sense of lost opportunities and dishonoured ideals, Himself retains the unclouded serenity which is the bright consummate flower of self-realization. This is not a difference of attainment in goodness; it is a different type of moral character, another order of humanity."

Now, this perfect unity of personality, the total absence of the sense of sin or discord, the presence of the highest claim to complete obedience to God's will and complete harmony with His Being presents for us a great problem, all the greater when viewed in connection with the lowliness of spirit, the humility and gentleness which characterized Christ and which have always been accepted as part of His portrait, even when the Christian theory has been denied. All this must have appealed strongly to the mind of Paul, who could speak so boldly of the sinless Christ and of his own sinfulness, of Christ as one with God and of the alienation and discord of man. Those were the very conceptions which appealed most cogently to Paul, and one of his greatest passages is a description of the tragedy of the divided soul. Either there or in the opening words of the Epistle to the Romans, where he boldly singles out the one fundamental ground for faith in the deity of our Lord, one would expect to find him settling unhesitatingly on this—the unique and unapproached solution in the consciousness of Jesus of this hopeless problem of the divided soul. Not so.

Another consideration with regard to Christ which is of convincing weight to many minds is His central

place in history. Young has dealt with this in "The Christ of History," and Edersheim in "Prophecy and History in Relation to the Messiah," and Farrar in "The Witness of History to Christ," and a hundred volumes have made study of it, and no one can write the history of mankind without facing the question. And human life today is full of witness to the centrality of Christ. Our calendars begin with Him. We interpret all the movements of the world in their relation to Him. Either they are efforts to fulfil His will and to build the kingdom of which He taught, and for which He wrought, or they are counter-movements of resistance and revolt.

Paul felt this truth deeply. To him, history was not mere annals. It bore a deep biological and moral significance. It was the self-realization of God in humanity, and Christ was the centre of it. It was in the central fulness of time that He had been born: "But when the fulness of the time came, God sent forth his Son, born of a woman, born under the law." And Christ is the principle and end of all history: "For in him were all things created, in the heavens and upon the earth, things visible and things invisible, whether thrones or dominions or principalities or powers: all things have been created through him, and unto him; and he is before all things, and in him all things consist." "In whom we have our redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of our trespasses, according to the riches of his grace; which he made to abound toward us in all wisdom and prudence, making known unto us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure which he purposed in him unto a dispensation of the fulness of the times, to sum up all things in Christ, the things in the heavens, and the things upon

the earth." And this truth in Paul's view was closely bound up with the Resurrection. "But now hath Christ been raised from the dead, the firstfruits of them that are asleep. For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, so also in Christ shall all be made alive. But each in his own order: Christ the firstfruits; then they that are Christ's, at his coming. Then cometh the end, when he shall deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have abolished all rule and all authority and power. For he must reign, till he hath put all his enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be abolished is death. For, he put all things in subjection under his feet. But when he saith, All things are put in subjection, it is evident that he is excepted who did subject all things unto him. And when all things have been subjected unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subjected to him that did subject all things unto him, that God may be all in all."

But when Paul singles out the essential and conclusive ground for his faith in the deity of the Saviour he passes by this tremendous truth, which he so clearly saw and so fully held, of the place of Christ in human history.

Nor does Paul use for the purpose the miracles of Christ's ministry. In an earlier day a great deal was made of the evidential value of Christ's miracles on nature. In them we do most surely believe. Furthermore, we have seen so many things in our own time which to our fathers would have appeared as miracles that we are not amazed, and the mechanistic notion of an iron-bound, material universe does not in the least intimidate us. But we do not make so much today of

Christ's miracles as proving His deity. We are disposed rather to consider His deity as proving the miracles. They are such deeds as such an One as He would do. We make much more in our thought of His mighty works and signs on lives and life when He was here on the earth and today. We see Him breaking habit, changing character, creating men. We see Him taking the "broken earthenware" from the human refuse heap and mending it so that the very seams of the mending disappear under the new beauty which His hands give to it. We know ourselves the miracles of redeemed and recreated men and women which He has wrought under our own eyes. And what is equally wonderful, we have seen and we see His works on the flow and volume, the direction and quality, of collective life. What Paul saw by faith in future years and only beginning in his own time, we see unfolding surely in the ripening dispensation of God.

We might well have expected the far-seeing statesmanship and the dauntless faith of Paul to have made this centrality of Christ in life and history the basis of his fundamental conviction. Or if not this, then surely some of the other considerations which we have named, or, like Matthew, he might have taken the Old Testament, as he knew so well how to do, and proved Jesus to have been the fulfilment of all its prophecy and history. Indeed, this seems to have been the character of his early missionary preaching. But all these things he passes by. "Jesus Christ," he says, "was declared to be the Son of God with power according to the spirit of holiness"—not by His character, or His teaching, or His consciousness, or His place in history, or His miracles, or His fulfilment of prophecy, but—"by His resurrection from the dead."

If this were an isolated and unrepeated expression of Paul's conviction it might be unwarranted to overemphasize it, but it is not isolated and unrepeated. A careful study of Paul's Epistles will show that the Resurrection of Christ was the central and dominating doctrine in the Christian faith and the central and dominating principle in the Christian experience. The Incarnate Life and the Cross and the death of Christ are indeed truths of infinite meaning and of indispensable significance, but Paul deliberately places the Resurrection above them: "It is Christ Jesus that died, yea rather that was raised from the dead." The Resurrection chronologically, of course, comes after the life and death of Christ, but Paul names it first: "That I may know him and the power of his resurrection and the fellowship of his sufferings": "Remember Jesus Christ, risen from the dead, of the seed of David." And most boldly of all in the great passage in the fifteenth chapter of First Corinthians, "And if Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain. Yea, and we are found false witnesses of God; because we have testified of God that he raised up Christ; whom he raised not up, if so be that the dead rise not. For if the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised: And if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins. Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished. If in this life only we have hope in Christ we are of all men most miserable." This is a very daring word. Nothing was of any avail, said Paul, without the Resurrection. If Christ had not risen, Christianity was a sorry thing to him, and there was no salvation. "But," we would remind him, "suppose Christ had not risen, there would remain the Incarnation, the

character of Christ, His teachings, the miracle of His personal consciousness, the mighty words of His ministry, His atoning death on the Cross. Are these nothing? " We would say, " No," but Paul says: " If Christ hath not been raised your faith is vain: ye are yet in your sins."

No, Paul's assertion in the beginning of his letter to the Romans is deliberate and authoritative: Jesus Christ was proved to be the Son of God with power by His Resurrection. We shall consider later the place of the Resurrection in Christian faith and life, in the doctrine and work of the Church, but we note here the calm opinion of Paul with regard to its unique significance. It proved Christ's deity. No mere man could thus conquer death and bring life and immortality to light. And it was the power of life needed by Paul and by the world: " But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by His Spirit that dwelleth in you."

So today the Resurrection ought to be conceived by us as the demonstration of our Lord's deity, and the power and principle of the Resurrection as the central essence of Christianity. Herein is the new Christian ideal of life—the new and risen life for the individual and for society. And here is the new measure of power, great enough to annul and reverse the past, to conquer death, to revise the world, to create the Kingdom of God. This is the true nature of Christianity, and it is the world's need—not morals only, but miracle; not admonition, but enduement. It is the miracle of purity which has been given—kept; purity which has been lost—restored; purity and love—given to a world of uncleanness and hate. Christ rose. God is

with us forevermore. We, too, may rise. Such a Lord is the Son of God with power.

"Rigid I lie in a winding-sheet
Which my own hands did weave;
My narrow cell is my self—my self,
Whose wall I may not cleave.

"But in the dawn of the early morn
A clear Voice seems to say:
'I am the Lord of the final Word—
Ye may not say me nay.

"'Unfold your hands, that your brother's need
May ever find them free.
Unbind your feet from their winding-sheet,
Henceforth they walk with me.'

"And lo, I hear! I am blind no more!
I am no longer dumb!
Out from the doom of a self-wrought tomb
Pulsate with life I come!"

III

THE SON OF GOD IS THE SON OF MAN

OUR Lord's favourite title for Himself was "The Son of Man." So far as we know, He never used at all some of the titles which we like best and use oftenest, such as Saviour and Redeemer. The ideas back of these names He did indeed approve, but He Himself associated these ideas not with these names but with His favourite title, "The Son of Man." "The Son of Man is come to seek and to save that which is lost." "The Son of Man came to give his life a ransom for many." Others of the titles of which we make use He did Himself use also: "Ye call me Master and Lord, and ye say well, for so I am." "Be ye not called Rabbi, for one is your Master, even Christ." He appears to have discouraged the use of "Messiah," but when the woman at Jacob's well referred to the Messiah's coming, He answered her plainly, "I that speak unto thee am he." He also accepted the title, "the Son of David," and explicitly declared that He was the Son of God. "The hour is coming and now is when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God." Indeed, it was for this assertion that He was killed (John xix, 7). More often He speaks of Himself simply as the Son. "The Father loveth the Son and hath given all things into his hands." More often still His term for Himself was Lord, but especially and evidently with special signifi-

cance He called Himself "The Son of Man." Thirty-nine times in the Synoptics, connecting parallel passages, He so calls Himself, and ten times in the Gospel of John. Is it not strange that we use so little the title that our Lord seems to have liked best?

Was this an original name with Jesus, or was it borrowed from the Old Testament or from the contemporary Messianic vocabulary? It is perhaps a matter of no great consequence, but each of these views is possible. The phrase is found in the Eighth Psalm, "What is man that thou art mindful of him, or the son of man that thou visitest him?" and in at least three other Psalms and more notably in the book of Daniel. The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews does not interpret the phrase in the Eighth Psalm as referring to Christ, and it does not seem in the least necessary to find our Lord's use of the title to rest on such quotations or even on the use of the words in Daniel, and still less on the frequent repetition of "son of man," without the article, as the designation of the Prophet Ezekiel in his prophecy. As to the borrowing of the title from current Messianic language, it is clear from the Gospels that Jesus discouraged the use of the Messianic name. He did not wish Himself and His mission to be conceived in terms of current Jewish thought as to the person and work of the Messiah (Matt. xv, 20). And the people who heard Him speak gained the idea that the conception of "the Son of Man" was not to be identified with their traditional Messianic notion. "We have heard out of the law," said they, "that Christ abideth forever, and how sayest thou 'the Son of Man must be lifted up'? Who is this Son of Man?" It may be said again that it is of no great consequence whether Jesus originated the title or

took it over from the Old Testament, but it is perhaps more sensible and more satisfactory to conceive that it was His own invention. Certainly He put absolutely new meanings into it.

What did the title mean to Jesus? Note His use of it in some of the great statements where it occurs, and consider carefully why He used it instead of some other, Master, Lord, Saviour, or Son of God. "The Son of Man is come to seek and save that which is lost." "The Son of Man hath not where to lay his head." "The Son of Man hath power on earth to forgive sins." "The Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister." "No man hath ascended into heaven but he that descended out of heaven, even the Son of Man who is in heaven." "And God gave him authority to execute judgment because he is the Son of Man." "Who do men say that I, the Son of Man, am?" "Ye shall see heaven opened and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of Man." "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood, ye have no life in you." "Now is the Son of Man glorified and God is glorified in him." "Until the Son of Man be risen again from the dead." "The Son of Man shall come in the glory of the Father." "Hereafter shall ye see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of power and coming in the clouds of heaven."

A little reflection on the significance of these illustrative passages will teach more than the commentaries, but it may be well to summarize the judgment of the commentaries also as to what Jesus meant by "the Son of Man." "Jesus, above all," says Godet, "obeyed the instinct of His love in adopting this designation of His person which expressed His feeling of the

perfect homogeneousness of the human family, of which He had made Himself a member. . . . He would designate Himself thus as the normal man, charged with accomplishing the victory of humanity over its own enemy and the enemy of God." "A simple man," says Baur, "to whom cling all the miseries which can be affirmed of any man whatever." "The one," says Holtzmann, "to whom may be applied in the highest degree anything which can be said of all other men . . . the indispensable centre of the Kingdom of God in humanity." "The perfect realization of the idea of man, with the mission of realizing it in humanity," says Wittichen. "The man in whom all the history of humanity must have its end" (Hofmann). "He who realizes the idea of humanity" (Neander). "The universal Messiah" (Bohme). "A true man," says Westcott, "and at the same time the representative of the race in whom are united the virtual powers of the whole of humanity." We will return to this question of the meaning of the phrase.

But meanwhile one notes with wonder that no one else spoke thus to or of Jesus. Why did not others use the title which was most approved by the usage of Jesus Himself? One disciple did so once in one momentous experience. When Stephen fell under the stones of his murderers, "being full of the Holy Ghost and looking up steadfastly into heaven," he said, "Behold, I see the heavens opened and the Son of Man standing on the right hand of God." The other exception might appear to be in Revelation i, 13 and xiv, 14, but the American Revision renders each of these passages "a son of man," making the words descriptive only of the appearance of the revelation which John beheld, not titles of the Saviour. Not once does Paul

use the words. The idea is perhaps in his conception of the Second Adam (Rom. v, 14; I Cor. xv, 45), "who gathers up into himself all humanity and becomes the source of a higher life to the race," but not once does Paul use the title which seemed most appropriate and satisfactory to our Lord Himself. This is strange, and yet not strange, for "it may well be admitted," as Westcott says in commenting on John i, 51, "that the early disciples did not at first apprehend all that the later history of the race enables us to see in the title. Perhaps it may have been from some sense of the mysterious meaning of the term, which had not yet been illuminated by the light of a Catholic Church, that they shrank themselves from using it. But we cannot be bound to measure the interpretation of Scripture by that which is at once intelligible. The words of the Lord are addressed to all time. They stand written for our study, and it is our duty to bring to their interpretation whatever fulness of knowledge a later age may have placed within our reach." But if the early Church seems for this or any other reason to have made little use of the title, it surely is strange that we make so little today. The theologies are full of discussions of other conceptions of Christ, but almost none of them deal in more than the most casual or inadequate way with the title dearest of all to Christ Himself.

Our neglect and loss are nowhere more evident than in our hymns. How few of them embody the conception and how still fewer make use of this name, "The Son of Man." Look through the hymnals and see how, even here where the theology of the Christian life is best expressed, the Saviour's name for Himself is absent. It is doubtful if in any one collection more

than half a dozen hymns can be found containing it. We have Bishop Mantz's:

"Son of Man, to Thee I cry
By the wondrous mystery
Of Thy dwelling here on earth
By Thy pure and holy birth.
Lord, Thy presence let me see;
Manifest Thyself to me."

And Dr. North's:

"Where cross the crowded ways of life,
Where sound the cries of race and clan,
Above the noise of selfish strife,
We hear Thy voice, O Son of Man."

And Dr. Merrill's:

"Lift high the Cross of Christ,
Tread where His feet have trod.
As brothers of the Son of Man,
Rise up, O men of God."

Beside these, there are a few more, old or new, but how scanty, how strangely few! Perhaps the reproach of the title to Man ignoring or evading its own Son, perhaps the terrible appeal and summons and judgment of the Name have kept us today, as, some reason, they kept the first Christians from calling Christ what He called Himself and accepting honestly the moral and intellectual and spiritual consequences of the conception.

Assuredly we need today the truth which our Lord meant to teach when He used the title, and used it as setting forth His moral and spiritual supremacy: " The Son of Man is Lord even of the Sabbath."

We need today the conception of Christ Himself which the words contain. To be sure, the other ideas are essential, too. "Rabbi," said Nathanael, "thou art the Son of God. Thou art the King of Israel." But there is something more. "Jesus answered and said unto him, 'Because I said unto thee, I saw thee underneath the fig tree, believest thou? Thou shalt see greater things than these.' And he saith unto him, 'Verily, verily, I say unto you, ye shall see the heaven opened and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of Man.'" We need to see Christ as the Son of Man in whom the complete conception of mankind was perfectly attained, the one absolute and perfect norm of man, of whom Sidney Lanier sang in "The Crystal Christ," with whose last words all men are familiar. But the preceding lines are not so well known. They call the roll of earth's greatest men and laud their greatness, but find in each some fatal defect or flaw. They are the sons of men. No one of them is the Son of Man. But Christ is *the* Son, the flawless man. And all the others were only children of their own day, of part of Man, not of Man whole, but Christ rose above all that was local and contemporary. "Cast your eyes," said Froude, in his Oxford lectures on "The Study of History," "over the human characters of history, and observe to how great an extent the most soaring and eccentric of them are the creatures of their country and their age. Examine the most poetic of human visions, and mark how closely they are connected, either by way of direct emanation or of reaction, with the political and social circumstances amidst which they were conceived; how manifestly the Utopia of Plato is an emanation from the Spartan commonwealth, how manifestly the Utopia of Rousseau

is a reaction against the artificial society of Paris. What likelihood, then, was there that the imagination of a peasant of Galilee, would spring at a bound beyond place and time, and create a type of character perfectly distinct in its personality, yet entirely free from all that entered into the special personalities of the age; a type which satisfies us as entirely as it satisfied him, and which, as far as we can see or imagine, will satisfy all men to the end of time."

And this is not a theological conception only. It is our moral hope. Christ, the Son of Man, is the very ideal and potentiality of every man. It is said that John Newton saw a felon led to punishment and remarked: "There, but for the grace of God, goes John Newton." Yes, but the nobler view is to look at Christ and say: "There, by the grace of God, am I. That is what God meant me to be. That is what, by God's help, here or hereafter, I can become. There is Man as God meant him."

Such a Son of Man is the Son of God, the more surely God as the most truly Man. The strong Son of God, as Tennyson sings in "In Memoriam," is the highest, holiest manhood. And so Myers also, in one of the most nobly Christian of all the poems of the centuries, "St. Paul":

"Not as one blind and deaf to our beseeching,
Neither forgetful that we are but dust,
Not as from heavens too high for our upreaching,
Coldly sublime, intolerably just:—

"Nay but Thou knowest, Lord Christ, Thou knowest,
Well Thou rememberest our feeble frame.
Thou canst conceive our highest and our lowest,
Pulses of nobleness and aches of shame.

"Therefore have pity!—not that we accuse Thee,
Curse Thee and die and charge Thee with our woe:
Not through Thy fault, O holy One, we lose Thee,
Nay, but our own,—yet Thou hast made us so!

"Then tho' our foul and limitless transgression
Grows with our growing, with our breath began,
Raise Thou the arms of endless intercession,
Jesus, divinest when Thou most art man!"

This is the Son of Man who is Lord even of the Sabbath and of the whole of life. We need this conception of Christ. But, in the second place, we need also the conception of religion and of Christianity which is involved in the Name best loved by our Lord, and which He used when He would teach us His place in life. The Son of Man is Lord of what? Why, of anything, even of the Sabbath, that is, of religion itself and of all the institutions and forms of religion. Perhaps we should have expected Him to say, "The Son of Man is Lord even of the week days, of the secular." But He said "of the Sabbath, of the sacred." For religion is the thing which can most easily escape from Christ. It was religion that rejected Him and crucified Him. It is of religion that we need to make Him Lord. In one of his letters, Mr. Gladstone expresses his fear that his religion might impair his morals. And "Rabbi" Duncan, who changed the face of theological thought in Scotland, used whimsically to express his dread of preaching as a bad habit into which Christian ministers might fall. These are no imaginary perils. I heard recently an earnest man declare that "an ethical theology would be no theology at all." But our Lord explicitly brought theology and religion under the moral law and the complete human ideal: "The Son of

Man is Lord even of the Sabbath," yes, of General Councils, Conferences, and Assemblies, and Boards, of sacraments and communions and institutions, of the Sabbath Day, of education and philosophy, of theology and economics and social practices. All these things, our very religion itself, must be Christian. The Son of Man must be its Lord. And He embodied this truth in one of the most awful warnings He ever spake, a warning which we should never pass over to any one else until we have first taken it home, relentlessly and adequately, to ourselves: " They shall put you out of the synagogues: yea, the hour cometh, that whosoever killeth you shall think that he offereth service unto God. And these things will they do, because they have not known the Father, nor me " (John xvi, 2, 3).

And lastly, we need today the conception of humanity embodied in the title " The Son of Man." Jesus was " the Son of Man, the representative of the whole race, in whom all the potential powers of humanity were gathered." " He is," as Canon Liddon said, " in a special sense, the Son of Mankind, the genuine offspring of the race. His is the Human Life which does justice to the idea of humanity. All human history tends to Him or radiates from Him. He is the point in which humanity finds its unity; as St. Irenæus says, He ' recapitulates ' it. He closes the earlier history of our race; He inaugurates its future. Nothing local, transient, individualizing, national, sectarian, dwarfs the proportions of His world-embracing Character; He rises above the parentage, the blood, the narrow horizon which bounded, as it seemed, His Human Life; He is the Archetypal Man in Whose presence distinctions of race, intervals of ages, types of civilization, degrees of mental culture are as nothing." Our Lord,

the Son of Man, is the Head of Humanity, in perfect sympathy with every man, of every age, of every nation. He is the picture of humanity as God willed it, as it may be, as it will be, if God's will is done.

In the autumn of 1881 the following poster appeared in bold type on the boardings of East London:

"THE BURIED LIFE

"There is a poem on 'The Buried Life' of which I am often reminded. Your lives are busy, useful, honest; but your faces are anxious, and you are not all you want to be. There is within you another life, a buried life, which does not get free. In old days it got free through old forms of religion, and then men had peace, and were not afraid of anybody or anything. We cannot go back to the old forms—they are gone with the old times and in presence of the new learning of our days. Many, therefore, have given up religion altogether, and carry about a buried life. It is buried, but it is not dead. When it really hears God's voice it will rise. Men will live spiritual as well as honest lives. They will rest on some One greater than themselves, and have peace. I don't think this life will be stirred by excitement or by irrational preaching—and not always by rational preaching; I believe that in the quiet of a place full of good memories, in the sound of fine music, in the sympathy of fellow seekers, we may better wait God's call. St. Jude's Church in Commercial Street will thus be open from 8:30 to 9:30 on Sunday evenings. Will you come and give yourself even ten minutes? It may be that, as you listen to the silence, to the music, or to the worship of others, God will speak, and that the buried life will arise, and that you will have peace."

The poster was Canon Barnett's. It embodied his deep conviction that in every individual and in humanity was the buried life, the Christed self, the capacity

and the divine purpose signified by our Lord's conception of Himself and of Mankind. "The Son of Man," Lord of all life, came to seek and to save all that was lost. The true end of life for man is to be found of Him, in Him to find our own lost selves. This is the end of life. But it is the first end, the beginning. In the beginning is the Word. And the Word is the Son of Man.

IV

THE VIRGIN BIRTH

IF we believe that the Gospels are true, we have no difficulty in believing in the Virgin Birth of our Lord. The Gospels unmistakably affirm that He was born of a virgin. This is the first, and for all of us who believe the Gospels, the sufficient ground for our conviction. Matthew and Luke teach the Virgin Birth as plainly and clearly and surely as they teach anything at all.

It is sometimes said that the story of the Virgin Birth is in only these two Gospels. But I do not see that that makes any difference. It is in both the Gospels which deal at all with Jesus' early life. The Gospels of Mark and John, after the Prologue, only begin with Jesus' public ministry as an adult man. Instead of saying, " The story is found in only two Gospels," it would be more fitting to say that "All the Gospels which deal with Jesus' childhood tell of the Virgin Birth." Furthermore, no one raises questions about teachings of Jesus because they are not found in all the Gospels. The full Sermon on the Mount is in only one Gospel. The stories of the Prodigal Son and of the Good Samaritan are in only one.

And as to the Gospel of Mark, something more is to be said. It does not contain the story of the Virgin Birth. But note how it begins: " The Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God," followed by the voice from

heaven, "Thou art my beloved Son." There is nowhere in the Gospel any mention of Joseph. It is the only Gospel which entirely omits him. And its omission is made very significant. Mark never refers to any popular notion of Jesus as Joseph's son. He speaks of Him only as Mary's son; "Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary?" He quotes the people's question about His brothers and sisters, but not about His father (Mark vi, 3).

"But," it is said, "neither John nor Paul refers to the Virgin Birth. It cannot, therefore, be fundamental." But the present question is not how fundamental a truth it is, but whether it is a truth. The fact that John and Paul did not refer to it, if this were the fact, would not prove that it was not true. Neither one of them refers to the Sermon on the Mount, nor to most of the events or sayings of Jesus' life. Their silence would not disprove the declarations of Matthew and Luke. But are we sure that they are silent?

John's Gospel begins with the loftiest assertion of the pre-existence of Jesus as the Eternal Word. He never mentions the name of Mary, but his frequent references to her are characterized by a deep and peculiar reverence. On the other hand, he never mentions Joseph save twice in quoting such references to him by others as would have been the common usage. But in each of these cases John at once supplies a complete corrective of the natural popular supposition that Joseph was Jesus' father. In the first case, Philip says to Nathanael: "We have found him of whom Moses in the law and the prophets wrote, Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph." But notice what follows, when Nathanael comes to Jesus. "Rabbi, thou art the Son of God." In the second case, the Jews said: "Is this not

Jesus, the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know? " Again, note what follows. John proceeds to quote some of Jesus' plainest words about the Divine Sonship, beginning at once with the reference to " the Father that sent me " (John vi, 42-65). Furthermore, in the Gospel of Luke, where there is the full story of Jesus' Virgin Birth, occurs just the same kind of statement of the popular view which John quotes, and in Luke iii, 23, where Luke calls Jesus " the son (as was supposed) of Joseph," and again in Luke iv, 22, where he quotes the popular word, " Is not this Joseph's son? " Obviously, the quotation of such a popular notion by Luke does not mean that he knew nothing of the Virgin Birth. Equally, it does not mean so in the case of John, who, when he speaks for himself, constantly reports words of Jesus as to His unique origin. " Ye know not whence I come," John says He told the Jews. And the reason the Jews sought to kill Him, John adds, was that He " called God His own Father."

And no language could be plainer than that used by Paul in asserting God's unique Fatherhood of Jesus. He quotes at Antioch the Second Psalm: " Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee," and immediately connects His unique origin with His unique end in the Resurrection (Acts xiii, 33, 34). And was not the Gospel of Luke Paul's Gospel? And both John and Paul,—the former in the Prologue of his Gospel and the latter in the first chapter of Colossians—deal with the pre-existence of Jesus in a way that makes it utterly impossible to think of Him as originating and entering the world as an ordinary human child. Dr. Charles A. Briggs, in his notable pamphlet on the Virgin Birth, now long out of print, sets forth the teaching

of Paul and what the Church has rightly inferred from it:

" The same might be said of St. Paul. It is evident that he represents Jesus as pre-existing as the theophanic angel of God of the Pentateuchal history (I Cor. x, 1-4), and in Godlike majesty and glory before He entered the world by incarnation (Phil. ii, 5-11), which he magnifies in several passages without mentioning human father or mother. This careful avoidance of the birth of Jesus, except in the general phrase, ' born of a woman ' (Gal. iv, 4) and ' of the seed of David according to the flesh ' (Rom. i, 3) may have been for prudential reasons; for St. Paul clearly teaches that Jesus Christ was the second Adam, the man from heaven with a life-giving spirit (I Cor. xv, 45-49), a spirit of holiness (Rom. i, 4), and that while Himself of the race of Adam, He was apart from the race in that He alone was possessed of sinless and incorruptible flesh (Rom. v, 12 ff.; viii, 1-4; II Tim. i, 10). St. Paul avoids telling us how Jesus Christ was born son of Adam, and at the same time different from every other son of Adam as Son of God. But the Christian Church saw very clearly that the necessary and inevitable consequences of his teaching were, that such sinless, incorruptible flesh could not be born of a human father by ordinary generation, but only of a pure virgin; and that such a holy and life-giving spirit could only originate by the power of the Holy Ghost, as the Gospels of Luke and Matthew tell us."

What Dr. Briggs sets forth so powerfully in his pamphlet is supplemented and reenforced by the elaborate treatment, supported by the widest scholarship, of the long chapter, " Born of the Virgin Mary," in his book, " The Fundamental Christian Faith."

In one word, the New Testament in certain books asserts unequivocally the Virgin Birth of our Lord,

and in its other books either assumes it or implies it, or says nothing inconsistent with it. If the New Testament representations of Jesus, accordingly, are trustworthy, the Virgin Birth must be accepted as a fact as reliable as any other fact of the life or character of the Saviour.

In the second place, we believe in the Virgin Birth because it has been the faith of the Church from the outset. Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch, early in the second century, in his epistles, speaks emphatically of the Virgin Birth. In his epistle to the Ephesians he writes: " Hidden from the prince of this world were the virginity of Mary and her child-bearing, and likewise also the death of our Lord—three mysteries of open proclamation, the which were wrought in the silence of God." In his epistle to the Smyrneans, he says: " I give glory to Jesus Christ, the God who bestowed such wisdom upon you; for I have perceived that ye are established in faith immovable . . . firmly persuaded as touching our Lord, that He is truly of the race of David according to the flesh, but Son of God by the divine will and power, truly born of a virgin, and baptized by John . . . truly nailed up for our sakes in the flesh, under Pontius Pilate and Herod the tetrarch."

Aristides of Athens in his Apology, written about the year 130, writes: " The Christians trace their descent from the Lord Jesus Christ; now He is confessed by the Holy Ghost to be the Son of the Most High God, having come down from heaven for the salvation of men, and having been born of a holy virgin. . . . He took flesh and appeared to men." Justin Martyr, in his First Apology, written between 140 and 150, says: " We find it foretold in the Books of the Prophets that Jesus our Christ should come, born of a virgin . . . be

crucified and should die and rise again, and go up to heaven, and should both be and be called the 'Son of God.'" And so we might quote Irenæus (190), and Tertullian (200), Clement (190), Origen (230).

Canon Randolph, in his little book, "The Virgin Birth of Our Lord," quotes Professor Zahn, of Erlangen, as saying: "This (the Virgin Birth) has been an element of the Creed as far as we can trace it back; and if Ignatius can be taken as a witness of a Baptismal Creed springing from early Apostolic times, certainly in that Creed the name of the Virgin Mary already had its place. . . . We may further assert that during the first four centuries of the Church, no teacher and no religious community which can be considered with any appearance of right as an heir of original Christianity, had any other notion of the beginning of the [human] life of Jesus of Nazareth. . . . The theory of an original Christianity without the belief in Jesus the Son of God, born of the Virgin, is a fiction."

So it is a complete error to say, as some have said, that the doctrine of the Virgin Birth was a late invention. It was part of the original New Testament records and of the accepted Gospel story.

In the third place, the doctrine of the Virgin Birth is natural, right and congruous. Jesus was unique. As Bushnell demonstrated long ago, "His character forbids His possible classification with men." That such a life should be as different in its origin and its end as it was in its spirit and principle and manifestation throughout is more natural, right and congruous than that it should have had a naturalistic ending and beginning. It was a supernatural life. We believe it harmonizes best with this fact about it that it also began and ended supernaturally.

In the fourth place, the work that Christ came to do and the place which He came to fill in humanity called for this unique and miraculous origin. It is sometimes said that the Virgin Birth is not essential to the deity of our Lord. That depends on our conception of His deity and of the saving work that He came to do. But He was the Saviour that He was and is, not only because of His character, but also because of the whole fact of His being, which included the supernatural uniqueness of His origin and personality. Dr. Du Bose sets this forth convincingly in his great book on "The Soteriology of the New Testament." And Dr. Briggs deals with it in a long passage in his pamphlet, which I quote:

"The battle for the Virgin Birth continued through the third and fourth centuries, though subordinate to more profound and subtle Christological problems. As it was necessary to maintain the reality of the birth of the Son of God over against those who held that the Son of God attached Himself to the man Jesus, either at His baptism, or when He first appeared in the temple, or after His birth; so it was just as necessary to maintain the Virgin Birth over against a more subtle form of Docetism which thought that the Son of God attached Himself in the womb of Mary to the child conceived by Mary; for in all these cases alike the same situation emerges that the man Jesus is a separate and distinct being from the Son of God, the union between them being only external or ethical, not at all vital and organic. Over against any such doctrine not only do the two Gospels that teach the Virgin Birth cry out, but also St. John and St. Paul, and the entire apostolic teaching. For St. John does not tell us that the Son of God took possession of the man Jesus, whether prior to His birth or later; but that He became man, and so became just as truly man as He had been truly God. So St. Paul

tells us that the pre-existing Son of God was born of a woman, and that He who was in the form of God took to Himself the form of man, and that this pre-existing divine person suffered and died, rose again and reigns with the name above every name. If only two writings teach the Virgin Birth directly, yet the whole New Testament cries out with one voice, without dissent, against any such idea as that the pre-existing Son of God merely attached Himself to the man Jesus.

"All those New Testament writings which emphasize the pre-existence of Christ think naturally of the divine side of the Incarnation, and are only concerned with its reality on the human side. It is significant that the two Gospels, which alone give the Virgin Birth, have nothing to say about the pre-existence of Christ. Interested in the life of Jesus, naturally they are most concerned with the mode of His entrance into the world. There is no inconsistency here, but only complementary teaching, both being necessary to the completed doctrine.

" It is true that I said in my sermon on the Virgin Birth, alluding to the previous discourses of the series: 'All that we have thus far learned of the Incarnation from the teaching of Jesus and the writings of St. Paul, St. John and the Epistle to the Hebrews, would stand firm, if there had been no Virgin Birth; if Jesus had been born of Joseph and Mary, having father and mother as any other child.' I see now that this language was not sufficiently guarded, and so it has been misinterpreted by many. I said this in a sermon in which I strove to maintain the reality and importance of the Virgin Birth, and I meant by this statement nothing more than what I have said already in this paper, that the express teaching of these passages of St. Paul and St. John does not give the Virgin Birth, and therefore cannot be used for or against it, or even against the opinion that Joseph was the father of Jesus. But when it comes to making logical deductions from these statements and reconciling them with the pre-existence and divinity of Jesus

Christ, and constructing a consistent dogma, it is an entirely different matter. These passages then also cry out against a human father, because a child begotten by ordinary generation would yield us an individual man, a separate and distinct person and being from the second person of the Trinity; God and man, not one person and being, the God-man.

" In these days when the authority of the Church counts but little to many minds, and when even the authority of the Holy Scriptures is questioned by not a few Christian scholars, it is inevitable that the whole range of Christian doctrines will come into the field of criticism, and that these will be compelled to maintain themselves against every variety of attack; most of all, the fundamental doctrine of Christianity, the Divinity of Jesus Christ, and the related doctrines as to His Incarnation and Virgin Birth.

" There are those who persuade themselves that they may hold to the Divinity of Christ without belief in a real Incarnation; or that they may believe in the Incarnation without the Virgin Birth. I have already recognized that a man may doubt or deny the third without, in his own mind, denying the second, or the first. And yet, from a historic and dogmatic point of view, he surely has put himself in an untenable position, which he cannot long maintain. Historically and logically, the Divinity of Christ and the Incarnation are bound up with the Virgin Birth, and no man can successfully maintain any one of them without maintaining all.

" The early Unitarians departed from the historic faith in the Holy Trinity at first into semi-Arianism, then they divided between Sabellianism and Arianism; but it was not long before most of them abandoned altogether the Divinity of Christ, and recognized Him only as the greatest of all prophets. The departures from the Nicene faith in recent times have taken another direction. Some have advocated a more subtle Nestorianism; but the most recent fad is to make Paul of Samosata the wronged apostle of their creed.

According to this ancient heretic, the man Jesus was inhabited by the Son of God, and was divine in the sense that God dwelt in him and influenced all his mental, moral and physical activities. This theory gives nothing more than an ethical union of deity with humanity. It is true that they try to bridge the chasm between the creator and the creature by denying that the creature man is of any different nature from his creator; and therefore the ethical union may be conceived of as so close that no practical difference exists. But in this they simply add pantheistic tendencies to an ancient heresy, and do not thereby improve it, but really make it all the more dangerous. Difficulties, numerous and of great magnitude, spring up on every side, much greater in many respects than those involved in the faith of the Christian Church. They still name Jesus Christ, God, and think of His entering the world by Incarnation, yet not in the historic sense of the Bible and the Church, but only in a sense which Bible, history and sound reason all alike condemn; for Jesus thus inhabited by the Son of God is really no longer divine as the one only unique Son of the Father, the second person of the Holy Trinity, but the first-born son of an innumerable family of sons of God—all gods as truly as Jesus Christ Himself, when they shall eventually become as fully inhabited by God as Jesus was. The Incarnation of the Son of God is then only a prelude to an indefinite number of Incarnations of sons of God in all perfected Christians. Of course, from the point of view of this error, Virgin Birth is no more needful for Jesus than it is for the Christian brethren. It is evident that these scholars use ' Son of God,' ' Divinity,' and ' Incarnation ' in unbiblical and unhistoric senses, merely as a cloak to cover doctrines which are as wide apart from the Nicene faith as earth from heaven.

" The Christ of the Bible and the Church is not merely a divinely inhabited man, but the God-man. The deity and the humanity are inseparable, and eternally united in one and the same divine person. Mary, the virgin, the mother

of Jesus, was the mother of God because she gave birth, not simply to a man, but God, who had become man in her womb when she conceived Him by the Holy Ghost. Christ is not God in the sense that He is the elder brother of an indefinite number of gods; but in the sense that He is, and always will be, the one only unique Son of the Father, the second person of the Holy Trinity. Only by a Virgin Birth could such a God-man be born into the world. A birth by human generation would give us only an individual man, inhabited by the Son of God, and so two distinct persons, the second person of the Trinity and the person of the man Jesus. That cannot in any way be reconciled with the faith of the Bible, or the Church. It is simply the revival of ancient errors rejected by the Church once for all and forever nearly fifteen centuries ago."

The Bible nowhere declares that knowledge of the Virgin Birth is essential to salvation, and there is much preaching of the Gospel in the New Testament which makes no mention of it. But this is true, also, of other facts in the life of our Lord. The Virgin Birth is not essential in this respect, but it is essential to the fulness of the Gospel. It is a fact which is part of the Gospel record and which is part of the whole meaning and significance of the Gospel. It is as essential an element in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke as the accounts of the Sermon on the Mount in those same Gospels. If they are trustworthy in their account of Jesus' teaching, they are equally trustworthy in their representation of the convictions of their writers with regard to the manner of Jesus' birth.

Lastly, we believe in the Virgin Birth of Christ because the alternative view is intolerable. If the story of the Virgin Birth is not true, then Jesus was the child of Joseph and Mary prior to their marriage, or of Mary

and some unknown father. Or else the whole story of Jesus' birth and infancy is undependable. The Virgin Birth is an integral and indispensable part of that story. If any one rejects it, it can only be on grounds that prevent him from keeping any of the rest of the story. And then Mary disappears altogether from the Gospel of Luke, for she is mentioned there only in the first two chapters. She disappears wholly from Matthew, also, except from the question in xiii, 55. And in John's Gospel her name is never mentioned at all. There is no evidence in support of the view adverse to the Virgin Birth, except on the basis of a presupposition against such a miracle. The only records which tell us anything at all of Jesus' birth and infancy tell us that He was born of the Virgin Mary. If the records are not to be accepted in this particular there is no reason for accepting any other statement which they make, except the reason of our own subjective disposition. In that case we make the history to suit ourselves. Even so it suits some of us best to believe that the whole wonderful life is most congruous and intelligible and true when accepted as supernatural from the first beginning to the last end.

V

WHY WAS CHRIST CRUCIFIED?

A FEW years ago I had the privilege for the first time of visiting Palestine. I think I had been in most of the lands of the world, but never before in the Holy Land. It was the richest and most glorious experience of one's life. We were there in the springtime and all of the wild flowers for which Palestine is the most famed land in the world were in bloom. Far and near the country was aglow with the scarlet anemone, the little flower to which our Lord referred as the Lily of the Field. The brakes by the water courses were pink with oleander and here and there on the hillsides the purple lupin lay like a royal robe. Day after day we moved up and down the country in the footsteps of our Lord, from the little village of Bethlehem, six miles south of Jerusalem, where He was born, one hundred miles north across the land to the little village of Nazareth, where He grew up as a boy, to the hill beyond the village where He must often have gone as a lad to look off westward over the blue waters of the Mediterranean, northward to the sunlight shimmering on the white snows of Hermon, southeast over the wide green plains of Esdraelon, to Jacob's well, where He talked with the woman, to Cæsarea Philippi or Banias, where the Jordan waters gush out from the great rocks, where Simon Peter witnessed his great confession, and through the dusty roads of the land beyond

the Jordan. One cannot go up and down over those Holy Fields and these ancient villages, with their sacred memories, without being aware that he is reading the Fifth Gospel; the whole geography of the land bearing witness to the truthfulness of the records of our Lord's earthly life.

But most of all does one feel these deep convictions as he comes in Palestine to the scenes of the last week of our Saviour's life among men. On Palm Sunday we walked, with a great company of fellow pilgrims from all over the world, on the morning pilgrimage from Bethany to Jerusalem, past Mary's Garden and Bethphage, to the Mount of Olives, with the vision of the Holy City. Then, on Maundy Thursday evening we went in a company to the little church just inside the Jaffa Gate, and there, gathered from almost every nation and race in the world, we sat down together around the Communion Table of our Lord, and then rose from the Sacrament to go through the dark, deserted streets of the city, through David Street and the closed bazaars, around by the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, down the long road of the Via Dolorosa and out to the Garden of Gethsemane, there to sit beneath the cloud-broken light of the Paschal moon under the olive trees where our Lord prayed in His agony. And then on Good Friday, in another great company, we walked with the pilgrims from almost every Christian community, once again along that sacred road by the Church of Ecce Homo, built over the pavement where Jesus stood that day before Pilate, the Judge of His judges, on past the seven stations of the Cross, to the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. It seemed as though the centuries had rolled away and we were back again in those great days that brought to an end the Great-

est Life of all. When now I hear the great negro spiritual—"Were you there when they crucified my Lord? Were you there when they nailed Him to the Cross? Were you there when they laid Him in His tomb? Were you there when He was risen from the dead?"—my heart answers, "Yes, I was there. I saw Him nailed upon the cross; I saw Him crucified on the green hill. I witnessed both the glory and the shame. I saw Him laid in Joseph's new-made tomb. And, blessed be God, I saw Him risen from the dead."

But that last thought we must put from our thought and mind just now. That will come later. I have a dear friend, Judge Joseph Buffington, of the United States District Court of Pennsylvania, a true and child-like Christian man, who told me years ago that he was accustomed every Holy Week to try to live through, hour by hour, all of the experiences of those first days. He tried to keep from his mind every future event, and he lived each Good Friday as though Jesus Christ had really been crucified and buried and was never to rise again and return, although now we know very well, thank God, that the Resurrection was only three days away. Then when Easter morning came he felt all the thrill of which Peter wrote in long after years: "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath begotten us again to a living hope by the resurrection." However, we are not to think of that now, but of the Cross on that little green hill and of a little part, at least, of what the dying of Jesus has meant in the world. And I should like to raise for our meditation in this chapter three great questions:

First: Why, historically, was Jesus Christ crucified? We are told by some that He was crucified because He was a social reformer who held some wild economic

theories about property and wages and who preached the doctrine that a man was of more value than a sheep. The capital and privilege of His day could not tolerate Him, and crushed Him. I remember an article which appeared some years ago in a labour paper called "Masses." The editor was commenting on a book by Miss Vida Scudder: "We believe in Jesus. We believe that He lived and died, labouring and fighting, in a noble atmosphere of disreputability, for the welfare of man. To us, His memory is the memory of a hero, and perhaps a good deal of our indignation against the Church arises from that. We are indignant not only because the Church is reactionary, but because the Church betrayed Jesus. The Church took Christ's name and then sold out to the ruling classes. The Church is Judas." Some hold this view of Jesus and, looking back across the years, think that this is why Christ was crucified. Some believe He died because He was a democrat, a political revolutionist whom imperialistic Rome snuffed out. He talked indefinitely about a kingdom and His disciples really thought He would be king. Others say that He was an impractical and a self-deluded visionary who collided with reality, and to whom a tragic death gave a not ignoble escape from disaster. And also we are told that He died because He was a great teacher and prophet in advance of His time, who realized the unpreparedness of men and folded the cross to His breast as Socrates drank the hemlock. These, however, are not the explanations given by the Evangelists for the death of Christ. The record is perfectly clear. The record shows that He was crucified because He claimed to be the Son of God, and men were not willing to endure one among them who made such a claim. There

are many today who think that the claim is a gloss and conclusion of a later time—that His disciples in years afterwards, as they brooded on what they had seen, let this idea grow in their thought until they expanded in various forms the simple teachings and claims of our Lord. Yet we remember the play by Don Marquis, called "The Dark Hours," and the essay at the end in which the author explains how he came to write his play and why he wrote it as he did; why he would not introduce the figure of Jesus on the stage. He could not bring himself to such desecration; so that every time Christ appears it is in some indirect way, by shadow, side word or otherwise. And then he justifies himself for making the tragedy hinge as it did on the claim of Christ to be the Son of God. He does not say that he accepts the claim. He does say that he is convinced that Christ made it, as He surely did. I do not see how any man can dispute the view that Christ made the claim, and because of that was put to death, except by rejecting the only records we have. Jesus Himself tells us why men hated Him, and the record is unmistakably clear: "For this cause therefore the Jews sought the more to kill him, because he not only brake the sabbath, but also called God his own Father, making himself equal with God" (John v, 18). "The Jews answered him, For a good work we stone thee not, but for blasphemy; and because that thou, being a man, makest thyself God" (John x, 33). "The Jews answered, We have a law, and by that law he ought to die, because he made himself the Son of God" (John xix, 7). This was the truth for which men killed Him. And this truth His death confirmed. This was the reason for His death, and this was the manner of it. The Roman soldier who stood over against the cross watch-

ing Him remarked to a companion, "I have seen a great many men die in my time, but I have never seen one die like this. Surely this man was the Son of God." Here, beneath the shadow of the cross, when we ask ourselves, simply historically, and not now seeking the deeper theological meaning, why Jesus Christ was crucified, the only truthful answer to be given is that He died because He was true to His nature and to His mission. He was killed because men could not bear and would not recognize the sight of God.

And this answer to the first query in a measure answers the second question of our meditation. Why is it that the death of Christ stirs us so, and has through all the ages so stirred men, and is stirring the hearts of men more today throughout the world than in any other year since Jesus Christ came? Why are more people observing Good Friday today than ever before in human history? Why is it that our hearts are stirred so by the Crucifixion? Because it was God who died for man. If it had not been God dying for man, but had been only man dying for man, would our hearts still be so stirred? They would be stirred, indeed, but not so stirred.

In His death were embodied two of the greatest principles by which mankind live and die. He manifested the principle of unlimited and utterly selfless love.

"He might have built a palace at a word
Who sometimes had not where to lay His head.
Time was when He who nourished crowds with bread
Would not one meal unto Himself afford.
He healed another's scratch, His own side bled,
Sides, hands and feet with cruel piercings gored.
Twelve legions girded with angelic sword
Stood at His beck, the scorned and buffeted.

O wonderful, the wonders left undone.
And scarce less wonderful than those He wrought.
O self-restraint passing all human thought,
To have all power yet be as having none,
O self-denying love which felt alone
For needs of others, never for its own."

By the principle of an absolutely unselfish and limitless love, He died for humanity's sake, refusing to use men's resources to further His own ends. He loved His own unto the uttermost. And the other principle was the principle of the power of weakness, of conquest by surrender, of victory by defeat. He found His Cross, and the Cross is today the emblem of triumph.

I had a letter some time ago from a friend who is a missionary in China. He said he had just had a visitation from a deputation of leading citizens from the Chamber of Commerce of another city in China. For years the people there had a strange dread of Christianity. They had identified it in their minds with the selfishness and violence of the so-called Christian nations, and they thought it meant the overthrowing of their dearest possessions. They heard that the Cross was an emblem of which Christians stood in awe and dread, and they had a mason carve five crosses in the stone pavement of the city gate. They felt sure that that would secure them against a Christian invasion within the walls of their city. But now, across the years, a new understanding had come, and they realized that these crosses stood not for something to be feared, but for something to be sought, and they had sent this deputation to my friend in Nanking with the offer of three acres in the heart of the city on which the Temple of the Earth stood, on the condition that he would send representatives to found a church and

school on this site of the Temple in the heart of the city. What had been through the years an emblem of fear had become a symbol of Christian victory.

Men said at the time of Jesus' dying, "This is the end." And beyond that end we look out over a world in which the Cross of Christ has become His throne. And seeing this cross standing there today on that hill of Calvary, our hearts are moved as they have been moved by no other tragedy.

But we know very well that there was something deeper in that great tragedy than a demonstration of unselfishness and the power of triumph through surrender. Something occurred there of far greater meaning than this. When that cry arose, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?"—have we ever paused to think what answer must have arisen in the heart of God? As the old king cried over the gate: "My son, my son, would God I had died for thee, O Absalom. My son! my son!" Can we think any lesser cry came back on that dark day out of the heart of God, echoing—"My Son, My Son—Jesus, My Son, My Son." What words filled that blank? Is this too bold and daring a thought? No doubt. No human thought or speech can fathom all that the Cross meant in God. But we know that it meant redemption for man, the annulment of sin and death. The Crucifixion was part of the supreme delivering and redeeming deed of God in the Incarnation, Death and Resurrection of His Son. I know a white gravestone that stands on a little hill in one of the villages of Central Pennsylvania. That is the holiest spot outside of Palestine in all the world to me, and again and again I go back to that green hill and stand beside that white stone with my mother's name on it, and read there the simple inscrip-

tion from the first chapter of the first Epistle of John—"And the blood of Jesus Christ, his Son, cleanseth us from all sin." This is not the only New Testament interpretation of the Cross. There are many more, and they must all be gathered into our thought: "For it was the good pleasure of the Father that in him should all the fulness dwell." "And you being dead through your trespasses and the uncircumcision of your flesh, you, I say, did he make alive together with him, having forgiven us all our trespasses; having blotted out the bond written in ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us: and he hath taken it out of the way, nailing it to the cross." "Since then the children are sharers in flesh and blood, he also himself in like manner partook of the same; that through death he might bring to nought him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; and might deliver all them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage." "And they sing a new song, saying, Worthy art thou to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain, and didst purchase unto God with thy blood men of every tribe, and tongue, and people, and nation."

All comes back to one word—"Unto him that loveth us and loosed us from our sins by his blood." An old gospel hymn puts it in other words:

"Dark was the stain that we could not hide.
What can avail to wash it away?
Look, there is flowing a crimson tide;
Whiter than snow you can be today."

We do not know how. We only know that nineteen hundred years ago a tragedy had to be wrought to cure the tragedy of the sin of mankind. Our hearts move

anew today, and deeper than before, as we think again upon the Crucifixion, because we see there the illustration of God's absolute and utter faithfulness and His willingness to pay the price, even with His own life, for the failure of man. And we see there, too, the utter futility of man. We are told that we must not talk about the tragedy, as though another race had perpetrated it. To speak of all this as having been done by the Jews who crucified our Lord, is not speaking the whole truth. It was not the Jews only who crucified our Lord. The Romans had their part in the crucifixion. Was it not the Roman Governor who handed Him over to be crucified? But it was not Roman or Jew. It was man. It is we who crucified our Lord, and when the old question is heard today—" Were you there when they crucified my Lord; did you see them nail His body to the tree? " the answer in the whole heart of mankind must be, " Yes, we were there. It was our hands that nailed Him to the cross; it was our hands that raised Him to His death; it was our hands that laid Him in His tomb." Why was Christ crucified? Because God died for us and for our salvation, because we had failed in all of God's hopes and purposes for mankind and were without hope and lost. I am not using our theological terms, but I will use the universal and divine word: " He died for us, the just for the unjust, to bring us to God." That is what moves us.

"Ask ye what great thing I know,
That delights and stirs me so;
What the high reward I win;
What the Name I glory in?
Jesus Christ, the Crucified."

Now there is a third question to raise. Why do we

perpetuate the cross? Why was it not enough that Christ should once have died? Why again and again throughout the years must mankind crucify the Son of God afresh and put Him to open shame? The most interesting thing that one saw, or could have seen, at the World's Fair, in Chicago, in 1893, was not the evidence of the world's material advance. It was a simple little painting that I watched man after man, woman after woman, hour after hour during the days of the Exposition, study and ponder over. It was a picture of the crucifixion; only the city was not Jerusalem, it was Paris. Here on one side, on the brow of a hill, standing beyond the smokestacks and the turmoil of a modern city, around the foot of the cross, not in the dress of Palestine, but in the artisan's dress of our present day, stood the disciples while the women took down the body. Over the brow of the hill, with clenched hands, looking down over the city, was Simon Peter, feeling all the horror of pity and wrath and shame at the city that had crucified the Lord. The crucifixion is not only an event of nineteen hundred years ago in a far-off land, in Jerusalem. The cross of Christ is raised everywhere, up and down the streets of our modern cities. We crucify the Son of God afresh today. We do it by denying His claim to be the Son of God. We let ourselves down thus to the very level and ground of the men who actually crucified Him nineteen hundred years ago. "And every spirit that confesseth not Jesus is not of God; and this is the spirit of the antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it cometh; and now it is in the world already" (I John iv, 3). We lend ourselves to that spirit of antichrist when, like Pilate, we wash our hands of Him, saying, "He is of no concern in our lives." Thus we crucify the Son of

God anew. We crucify Him by repudiating His Spirit, and we repudiate His Spirit by indifference to truth, by intolerance, by our hardness of heart. The unity of the Spirit, the unity of the faith, the unity of the fellowship are obligations of the Cross. All hatred and discord and division that destroy the true unity of man are the crucifixion of the Son of God afresh, who came to break down the walls of hatred and separation and by His blood, His death and His life, to make all men one. We repudiate Him not by our open antagonisms only, but by our indifference to the truth, when we mess together in one conglomerate mass that which is true and that which is not true. And when we are guilty of any impurity of mind or flesh or spirit, we crucify the Son of God afresh who died for us that we might be clean and right and pure as He was pure. " How does our Saviour look? " reads an old gravestone of a little boy in the Moravian cemetery in Bethlehem. " ' Right clean,' was his reply." We crucify the Son of God afresh by our disbelief—by settling down in the night and disbelieving in the dawn, by not realizing that the Cross that was raised nineteen hundred years ago was raised not as the end, but as the beginning; not as a witness to a great failure, but as a symbol of the triumphant deed of God for the life of man. We crucify the Son of God afresh when we refuse to lay the cross on all human life and to bring all human life and lay it down beneath the shadow of the cross, for its forgiveness, for its cleansing, for its purity, for its brotherhood. For there were three crosses. Even in His death He was not divided from His brethren. Let the three crosses speak their rebuke to all the divisions and unbrotherliness of our distrustful world. Will we again crucify the Son of God today, in our own

lives, in the life of the city; will we persist in raising His cross again, year by year, day by day, on the hill of all the injustice and wrong and inequality of our modern world, or will we learn at last the lesson which they learned who once saw Christ die and ever after lived by the power of His endless life?

"Oh, Cross that liftest up my head,
I dare not ask to fly from thee.
I lay in dust, life's glory dead,
And from the ground there blossoms red,
Life that shall endless be."

VI

THE RESURRECTION—THE CENTRE OF CHRISTIANITY

SEVERAL years ago there appeared in Scotland a unique volume of biography entitled, "Men of the Knotted Heart." The title of the little book was a Hebrew idiom for friendship. It was the story of two lifelong friends who were ministers in two different Christian communions and who lived together for more than thirty years in the town of Greenock. Their lives were interwoven as though they were one. The book which told this story was a masterpiece of literary taste and beauty. One chapter would deal with the life of one of them and the next with the life of the other, and the next again wove the two lives together. Then they would be separated, only to be knotted together into one again. The breath of the heather was on every page, and each word was full of pure cleansing. One of the men was named Grant and the other Struthers. They belonged to the same club in Greenock, and they made it a practice to meet together there. It was observed that as Grant entered the club he was accustomed to pause at the door with his hand on the latch while he said something softly to himself. Friends who saw him stop at the door with moving lips, before he passed in, wondered curiously what it might mean. And one day someone ventured to speak to Struthers about it and to ask him if he knew what Grant was say-

ing when he stood at the door. "Why, yes, I know," Struthers replied, he is saying 'Christ is risen. Christ is risen.'" For years that had been his way of passing and holding his life under the habit of the daily recollection of the Resurrection as the principle of the Christian life.

The Resurrection is not a secondary or dispensable fact in Christianity. It is central and fundamental. I am not seeking now to state the basis of our Christian conviction that the Resurrection is not simply a symbol of the immortality of the soul but a solid historic fact, as unique as the Virgin Birth of our Lord. The ground on which we believe both of these facts seems to me to be adequate and assured, and they are assumed here. It is to the significance of the Resurrection in its bearing on our practical work and life that I wish to refer.

But it is well to pause to summarize a few of the reasons for faith in the fact of the Resurrection which satisfy the Christian mind. In the first place, the miracle of the Resurrection is the natural and appropriate ending of such a life as Christ's. As Godet says:

"It is said: Such a fact would overthrow the laws of nature. But what if it were, on the contrary, the law of nature, when thoroughly understood, which required this fact? Death is the wages of sin. If Jesus lived here below as innocent and pure, if He lived in God and of God, as He Himself says in John vi, 57, life must be the crown of this unique conqueror. No doubt He may have given Himself up voluntarily to death to fulfil the law which condemns sinful humanity; but might not this state of death, affecting a nature perfectly sound, morally and physically, meet in it exceptional forces capable of reacting victoriously against all the powers of dissolution? As necessarily as a life of sin ends in

death, so necessarily does perfect holiness end in life, and consequently (if there has been death) in the Resurrection."

In the second place, the Gospel evidence for the Resurrection is overwhelming. All four Evangelists assert that Jesus rose. Their testimony has been subjected to more severe examination than any other historic evidence on record, and it stands unshaken. The only substantial case against it rests on the assumption that a miracle cannot happen and that no evidence can be supplied to prove a miracle. This is the attitude of the "modern mind." There cannot be any satisfying evidence for the Resurrection because there could not have been any Resurrection. But that is to beg the whole question, and to do it by shutting up the mind against what, to the open and unprejudiced view, is the most reasonable solution of the problem. And what right has any one to exclude such a solution? Virchow would not do so. Sir Alexander Simpson, for years professor in the University of Edinburgh Medical School, and himself an earnest Christian believer, says that he asked Virchow, "the man who had made so many hundreds of operations, if he had any difficulty in believing in the Resurrection." "No," replied Virchow, "why should I?" The contrary assumption closes the case in advance. If we are not bound by such an assumption, then the evidence offered is convincing.

In the third place, as we have already seen and as we shall note again, Paul affirms in the most unequivocal way his belief in the Resurrection. His writings are full of it. In some of his Epistles he says nothing of the Cross, but in almost every one he makes much of the Resurrection. Indeed, he stakes everything on it. If Christ did not rise, he says, there is nothing in Chris-

tianity worth troubling about. Now, Paul was no easy believer. He began, as we have marked, with implacable hostility to Christianity. He took responsibility for open and merciless repression. And then he absolutely reversed his position, and he went over the world preaching the Gospel of the Resurrection. What convinced him, convinces us.

In the fourth place, the Christian Sabbath offers its institutional witness. From the beginning it testified to the fact which had created the day and given it its significance. The Fourth of July is the strongest historic evidence we have of the Declaration of Independence. Such a tradition, embodied in a continuing institutional observance unshaken through the centuries, is the most powerful witness we can conceive. What changed the Jewish Sabbath into the Christian for the Church? What but the fact which the Christian Sabbath commemorates, and commemorated from the beginning?

Lastly, we believe in the Resurrection of Christ because it alone, as we shall note, accounts for the Resurrection of Christianity. When Jesus died, Christianity died. Its leader and its life were gone. Then suddenly it rose. And it rose with far greater power than it possessed when Jesus was here. Here is a great effect to be accounted for. How can we account for it? The New Testament gives one adequate explanation. Jesus rose and came back to men. The faith which had died with Him rose with Him. And the men who had one day lost heart and conceived Christianity only as a dear memory of One who had been with them but was now gone forever from their lives, the next day had risen up, lifted into a new life by the sight of their Risen Lord, and went forth in the power of the Resurrection to conquer the world.

What but the Resurrection explains the existence of Christianity? Has it not died a thousand times? Have not men again and again destroyed it? Unbelief, war, sin, materialism—a score of deadly forces have antagonized and annihilated it. Yet it lives. From each destruction it rises by the power of the Resurrection. And by that power it is even yet to prevail. The might by which God raised Christ from the dead will avail to overcome all that hinders and to complete in God's good time the triumph which began when Christ arose.

But faith like this, men say, is not possible in the light of modern knowledge. On the other hand, it is just as possible now as it ever was, and just as necessary. Modern knowledge no more makes impossible a supernatural Christ, born of a virgin and risen from the dead, than ancient knowledge. All true knowledge, modern and ancient alike, must make room for facts. And the supreme fact of history, the fact of saving significance to men, is the uniqueness of Christ and His supreme uniqueness, in both life and death, and in Life that is stronger than death.

The Resurrection is the great differentiating fact in Christianity in comparison with the non-Christian religions. Not one of these contains the idea or the principle of the Resurrection. Some of them contain the conception of the incarnation; some of them present men like Mohammed or Buddha, who appear as prophets of God or whom time has come to represent as God Himself, but they allege no Resurrection either of men or of God become man. Only Christianity alleges the fact of a Resurrection or conceives Resurrection as a spiritual principle operative in human life.

Several years ago, in a great Indian city, I went to call upon a Hindu gentleman of high character and of

great influence. While waiting for him, I was interested to see on the wall a large picture of Spurgeon. When he came in I spoke of it, and he expressed his great admiration for Spurgeon, whom he had gone to hear preach in London. He said he liked the earnestness of his conviction, but he did not like one sermon which he heard describing the penalty and judgment of sin, and he thought unfavourably of the way in which Mr. Spurgeon sometimes announced the collection, " If any one is not willing to part with something, let him leave." He thought that Christianity would not be accepted by India, as Europe had accepted it, as a new religion from without, but that Hinduism would discover in itself the principles and values of Christianity, not reading these into Hinduism, but discovering that they were already there. I ventured to bring forward what seemed to me to be the fundamental distinction between Christianity and the non-Christian religions, namely, the fact and meaning of the Resurrection. He replied that there was no Resurrection in Hinduism, neither of God nor saint, but that all that is of moral value in the conception was supplied by apparitions, and that the idea of apparitions in the body was very familiar to Hindus. But I asked how the idea of transmigration could be reconciled with the doctrine of the Resurrection, or how the moral values of the Resurrection could be drawn from apparitions in a religion of transmigration. He replied that Hinduism was a philosophical and vague religion, not logical and accurate, that the English temporized in politics and the Indians in religion, that Hinduism could not be pressed into any logical exactitude. As a matter of fact, it contained no such idea as the resurrection.

Some time later, in a village in northern Persia, we

were discussing with a little group of Mohammedans, of whom I have already spoken, the characters of Christ and Mohammed, and comparing the religions which bore their names. I asked them what they made of the fact that Mohammed died and that was the end of it, and that Christ died and rose again. All waited for the mollah to answer. "Outwardly," said he, "it is true that our prophet died, but inwardly he lives and is nearer to us than our jugular vein." This is a favourite figure of speech with Persian Mohammedans. Yes, we asked, and did he have conscious spiritual communion with Mohammed, and could he tell us where in the Koran Mohammed had authorized this idea of a conscious spiritual fellowship between his immortal spirit and the faithful believer? No, he could not cite the sura of the Koran in which the idea could be found, but with undiminished earnestness he repeated his metaphor of the jugular vein. "But that is not for us common people," one of the laymen broke in. "What the mollah says may be very true, but such ideas are only for him and the sayids and mujtehids. We common men know nothing of this communion with the prophet as close as our jugular vein." Nor would any mollah except in such an argument, not even the mollahs to whom religion is a real mysticism, have advanced the idea of a communion with Mohammed conceived as Christians conceive the risen Christ.

Paul's experience with the non-Christian religions of his day brought sharply into view the novelty and distinction of the Resurrection. "Now when they heard of the resurrection of the dead," we read in his speech on Mars Hill, "some mocked." The other ideas he set forth were not so novel as to challenge any attack, but the Resurrection was the decisive issue. As one reads

the New Testament he sees at once the central place which it fills in the conviction and in the experience of the early Church. The fact of it was fundamental in the Christian thought, and the principle and significance of it were fundamental in the Christian life.

Let us note first this recognition and acceptance of the Resurrection as the habitual and controlling principle of Christian life. It was unquestionably such a principle in the early Church. Let us remind ourselves of St. Paul's great words in the sixth chapter of Romans and of what they reveal as to the moral significance of the Resurrection in Christian experience: "Or are ye ignorant that all we who were baptized into Christ Jesus were baptized into his death? We were buried therefore with him through baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, so we also might walk in newness of life. For if we have become united with him in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection; knowing this, that our old man was crucified with him, that the body of sin might be done away, that so we should no longer be in bondage to sin; for he that hath died is justified from sin. But if we died with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with him; knowing that Christ, being raised from the dead, dieth no more; death no more hath dominion over him. For the death that he died, he died unto sin once; but the life that he liveth, he liveth unto God. Even so reckon ye also yourselves to be dead unto sin, but alive unto God in Christ Jesus."

And let us recall also his memorable words of appeal in writing to the Colossians: "If then we were raised together with Christ, seek the things that are above, where Christ is, seated on the right hand of God. Set

your mind on the things that are above, not on the things that are upon the earth. For ye died, and your life is hid with Christ in God. When Christ, who is our life, shall be manifested, then shall ye also with him be manifested in glory.

"Put to death therefore your members which are upon the earth: fornication, uncleanness, passion, evil desire, and covetousness, which is idolatry; for which things' sake cometh the wrath of God upon the sons of disobedience; wherein ye also once walked, when ye lived in these things; but now do ye also put them all away: anger, wrath, malice, railing, shameful speaking out of your mouth; lie not one to another; seeing that ye have put off the old man with his doings, and have put on the new man, that is being renewed unto knowledge after the image of him that created him: where there cannot be Greek and Jew, circumcision and uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, bondman, freeman: but Christ is all, and in all."

Let us ask ourselves whether we thus live with Christ in the Resurrection. Do we make this principle of new life in Christ the law, the living instinctive law, of all our daily ways, our thoughts and desires, our hopes, our attitudes and our ambitions? Some years ago I had a discussion with a friend as to the place of the Cross in doctrine and life in the New Testament. We decided that we would make a fresh study of the New Testament, and to our amazement we found the Cross not fading out of sight, but dropping behind the glory of the Resurrection. It would be worth the while of each one of us to begin now to review carefully each word of the New Testament afresh and to find out, as we shall, the supreme place which the Resurrection held in the lives of the men who had known Jesus

Christ after the flesh, and through them in the lives of men who had never thus known Him, but to whom and in whom He lived as the Risen and Ever Present Lord.

Not only is the Resurrection the principle of the Christian life, but in the New Testament it is the foundation of the Christian faith. Ask St. Paul about this matter. He was the boldest spirit and the most massive mind in the early Church. Next to Christ, indeed, he is the dominant mind in the world today. Here was one who had been fiercely set against the Christian thought of Jesus, but whose attitude was so completely reversed that he became the boldest and most unhesitating preacher of the Gospel of a living Saviour which he had set out relentlessly to destroy. What brought about this change? First of all, it was a great fact of experience which happened on the Damascus road, and which convinced him that Jesus, who had died, was alive. The Resurrection became to him a matter of experience. It became also the basis of all his reasoned conviction concerning the Gospel. On the Resurrection, and the Resurrection alone, he staked everything! "If Christ hath not been raised, then is our preaching vain. And if Christ hath not been raised your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins. Then they also that are fallen asleep in Christ have perished. If we have only hoped in Christ in this life, we are of all men most pitiable. But now hath Christ been raised from the dead."

It was the Resurrection that convinced Paul of the central fact of the deity of Christ. Let us recall and summarize the statement by Paul of the sober intellectual basis of his faith. It was not the character of Jesus to which he turned. The Epistles teem with Paul's high ethical summons, and he might have appealed to the perfect exemplification of his moral ideals

in Christ as the most convincing of apologetic arguments. He never does so, and only on the rarest occasions does he refer to the moral characteristics of the Saviour at all. We find in the loveliness of our Lord's human life the richest assurance of faith and an object of deep imaginative yearning. We sing with our children, and more discerningly even than they:

"I think when I read that sweet story of old,
When Jesus was here among men,
How He called little children as lambs to His fold,
I should like to have been with them then.

"I wish that His hands had been placed on my head,
That His arms had been thrown around me,
And that I might have seen His kind look when He said,
'Let the little ones come unto Me.'"

But there is no trace whatever in St. Paul's Epistles of any such longing or reference to the loveliness of Jesus' human life as evidence of His deity.

Was it, we ask again, the teaching of Jesus that was the ground of St. Paul's unique conception? St. Paul was a teacher himself, but it is a strange fact that only twice did he appeal to the teaching of Jesus as supporting his own teaching or as evidencing Jesus as the Teacher come from God. The greatest teacher next to Jesus made no appeal to Jesus as the Master Teacher, who, only as God, could have known, as He knew, the things of God.

And, it should be said again, Paul says nothing about the miracle of the personal consciousness of Jesus. One would have thought he would have done so. No problem, as we have remarked, more concerned Paul than the problem of the divided will, the man rent asunder

within. But here in Jesus was the one absolutely harmonious soul, no lower and higher nature at ceaseless war for ascendancy, but the paradox of a perfect life, humility without penitence and loftiness without pride. One, and One alone, could say, "I and the Father are one," and "I am meek and lowly of heart." One would have thought that here, supremely, St. Paul would have found the conclusive and irrefutable proof of his faith in Jesus as God's Son and as God. Not so. He found it only in the Resurrection. "Jesus Christ," says he, in one of his noblest arguments, "who was born of the seed of David according to the flesh, was declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection." And here for us, too, is the impregnable rock upon which Christian conviction rests—Jesus Christ rose again from the dead.

Let us reflect, in the third place, on the Resurrection as the dominant element in the Christian message. It was the central note of the Church's message as recorded in the Book of Acts ii, 24; iii, 15; iv, 2, 10, 33; v, 30; x, 40, 41; xiii, 30-37; xvii, 2, 3, 31, 32; xxiii, 6, 8; xxiv, 15, 21; xxv, 19. This last verse is illustrative of all. It is Festus's account of Paul's teachings, "of one Jesus who was dead whom Paul affirmed to be alive." And in almost every one of Paul's Epistles appears the same affirmation and the assertion of the Resurrection as the central principle of Christianity. Take the Epistle to the Romans alone. Jesus was shown to be the Son of God with power by His Resurrection. His righteousness is imputed to us, "if we believe on him who raised up Jesus, our Lord, from the dead." "As Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life."

And so throughout, his one thought is of a Lord of life risen in reality from the dead, who lives in us and by whose life we live a new and risen life. Romans iv, 25; v, 10; vi, 5-13; vii, 5, 6; viii, 11, 34; xiv, 9; xv, 18. And Peter is as clear in this as Paul. I Peter i, 3, 21; iii, 18, 21. And also John, Revelation i, 5, 18; ii, 8.

The Resurrection was the joyful, victorious, inspiring note of the Apostolic Gospel. In Harnack's great missionary book, one of the greatest missionary books ever written, "The Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries," he attempts to recapture the primitive missionary message. What did those first missionaries preach? Harnack concludes that this preaching contained four great elements: God the Father as Creator, Jesus Christ as Saviour, purity, and the Resurrection. We preach a different Gospel from the conquering Gospel of the New Testament and of the early Church, unless we also proclaim these four glorious notes.

And especially, any version of Christianity which does not give the Resurrection this central place is not in harmony with the original. "We must speak out," said William Wilberforce, in "A Practical View of Christianity," of some teachers; "Their Christianity is not Christianity. It wants the radical principle. It is mainly defective in all the grand constituents." And Newman, in "The Church of the Fathers," said: "Many spirits are abroad, more are issuing from the pit; the credentials which they display are the precious gifts of mind, beauty, richness, depth, originality. Christian, look hard at them in silence, and ask them for the print of the nails." And ask them not for the print of the nails only, but also about the stone rolled

from the grave and the linen clothes lying where the body had been, and for a Living Presence and Power.

The Resurrection is the proof and the pledge of the power of the Christian life. We are accustomed to speak of the power of the Holy Spirit as the great energy of Christianity. It is so. But in what connotation is this power set forth in the New Testament? Inseparable from the Resurrection. So Peter declared on Pentecost: "This Jesus did God raise up, whereof we all are witnesses. Being therefore by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, he hath poured forth this, which ye see and hear." The Risen Christ is the proof and donor of all power, and the Resurrection is the pledge and measure of it. How may we know "the exceeding greatness of his power to usward who believe"? Why, "According to that working of the strength of His might which He wrought in Christ when He raised Him from the dead." There is no possibility of disconnecting the power of the Holy Spirit from the Resurrection. The power of the Holy Spirit raised Jesus from the dead. He was declared to be the Son of God with power according to the Spirit of Holiness by His Resurrection. And it was the power of the Risen Christ which came forth in the Holy Spirit, given without measure to men. The Incarnation showed what God could do with the pure and surrendered will of a girl. The Resurrection showed what God could do all alone. It was not possible that Jesus should be holden by death. Vain the watch, the stone, the seal. Vain the gates of death and hell. To such a conqueror all power has been given. "Christ is risen. Alleluia."

How vividly we can feel all this in Peter's long-after recollection of this first Easter morning. Surely it is

not fanciful to find in his words the reminiscent thrill of that wonderful dawn: "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who according to his great mercy begat us again unto a living hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead." He had been reborn that morning. What would we not give to have the record of the conversation between him and John as they came away from the empty tomb. "John," we can hear him say, "He is alive—can you believe it? He is alive. Man—anything can happen." And since then anything indeed can happen, since Christ hath burst the bars. Thank God, even the missionary undertaking is not a delusion. We, too, can do today what the power of the Resurrection did in and through a little band of poor and resourceless men gathered in Jerusalem nineteen hundred years ago.

The fundamental question for us is, Have we such a Supernatural Gospel? Or is our Gospel only an appeal to our own energies and, at the most, a rich emotional release of our own resources. The New Testament conviction was that it was infinitely more than this, that it was the appearance in the natural order of a power from without the natural order. A great fact had occurred which demonstrated this to their own senses, and in their own experience they knew the consequences of this fact. Christ was alive not in their memories as a departed friend, of whom they thought and whose gracious words and deeds they recalled, but as a living person, acting with the power by which He had transcended death. With such a power operating within them there was no weakness which they, too, could not transcend, nor any duty which they could not do. In their own hearts and in their service of the world, Christians know "the exceeding greatness of

God's power to usward who believe, according to that working of the strength of his might which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead, and made him to sit at his right hand in the heavenly places." Buried with Christ in His death, Christians are raised with Him through faith in the working of God, who raised Him from the dead (Col. ii, 12). This is the faith men need today.

They need it in the foreign mission field. The work to be done there is the work of resurrection. Some years ago I wrote to a Japanese friend who had been my interpreter on a speaking trip among the Japanese churches, speaking of the place of the Resurrection in Christianity and telling of some correspondence with a friend who had complained of Paul's emphasis on the Resurrection in contrast with the simple ethical teaching of Jesus in the Gospels. The Japanese replied: "How glad I was when your letter reached me! Another feeling I had when I finished reading your letter. You have imparted a great knowledge to me about the divine character of our Lord. Like the banker you referred to in your letter, I did not place so much stress on the power of His Resurrection as I do since reading your letter. For a whole week since then I found myself thinking about His Resurrection. I began to recall the sermon I gave on Easter morning, and be sorry about it. We all know the teachings of Jesus Christ and the historical facts concerning His Resurrection, and yet most of us Christians do not experience the power of Resurrection in us. Christian knowledge and Christian churches we have everywhere in Japan. What we lack is Christianity in power and in Resurrection." Foreign missions are a futility, or if not a futility only a helpful moral reform, without the energy

of a living Christ who is stronger than death and all the forms and fruitages of death.

And not in foreign missions only, but in all the tragedy of the world today, our supreme need is for the faith of the Resurrection. Out of the shattered ruins of human disorder a new world may be built, a world with a new heaven over a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness, if only men will believe again in the Resurrection and trust in the power of God who raised Jesus from the dead and who is ready to raise man, also.

Lastly, therefore, we remind ourselves of the Resurrection as the assurance of the Christian hope. It was the rebirth of a dead hope to the early Church. Christian hope had been slain in the crucifixion; had died and was buried with the Lord. One feels the reality and pathos of it in the story of the walk of the two disciples to Emmaus: " We had hoped it would be he who would have redeemed Israel." But with the Resurrection rose again the faith and hope of Christians. They, too, were as dead men come to life again. Peter says it all in his jubilant memories which I have quoted, " Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who according to his great mercy begat us again unto a living hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead." From the night of the new tomb in Joseph's garden, Christian hope came forth alive and aglow. Where else shall we find our hope? Have we not seen death and witnessed the end? But Christ is risen, and here our life is quick and new and sure.

We need this hope in our time. Often during these days when we discuss, light-heartedly, the question of the security of missionaries and the establishment of the Church one's mind turns to the cost and method of all real spiritual and creative achievements, " Except

a grain of wheat fall into the earth and die, it abideth by itself alone; but if it die it beareth much fruit." There are often, in one's thought, the events in Nanking in the spring of 1927. If ever in history a tragedy picked out for its victim a Christlike spirit, it did it then when it chose in John Williams one of the truest and best friends China ever had. But hope did not die in him. If he could have chosen who should offer to fall he would gladly have chosen as the will of God chose. He knew the law of the corn, and he rested in the sure hope of the Resurrection, for himself and for China, knowing well that all that is laid down is taken up again with the glory of the Rising.

As for him, so for China. At the Christmas time after her husband's death, Mrs. Williams, who had returned to America, received a Christmas letter from fifteen young Chinese in Nanking who had loved her husband and who had learned new lessons of life's meaning and power from his death and life, and they closed their letter with the lines:

"Ye that have faith to look with fearless eyes
Beyond the tragedy of a world of strife,
And know that out of death and night shall rise
The dawn of ampler life,
Rejoice, whatever anguish rend the heart,
That God has given you the priceless dower
To live in these great times and have your part;
That ye may tell your sons who see the light
High in the heavens, their heritage to take,
'I saw the powers of darkness take their flight;
I saw the morning break!'"

The morning is ever breaking for those who know the meaning of Easter day. "I am the resurrection

and the life," saith the Lord. "Behold, I make all things new." Not by the sign of a cross on waving banners borne in war, may we conquer, but by the sign of a cross which witnessed to life laid down in love, and by the sign of an open grave, and the presence of a Living Saviour. From the grave where they laid the Son of God the stone is rolled away and hope is born and new life is come. Christ is risen! Allelulia, Alleluia!

VII

THE MASTER AND LORD OF LIFE

NEITHER the painters nor the sculptors have ever been able to provide for us a satisfactory representation of Jesus. The task no doubt is an impossibility. One of the foremost men of South America, Snr. Ricardo Rojas, Rector of the University of Buenos Aires, spent years seeking all over the world for some picture or statue of Christ that would satisfy his mind and heart, and found none. He turned accordingly to words, and sought to present an acceptable likeness in a remarkable little book, just translated into English, entitled "The Invisible Christ." But can even words avail?

Our difficulty is with the overemphasis, in the traditional representation, of the passive and repressive qualities in our Lord's character. Those qualities assuredly are there. One of the greatest intellectual forces in the Spanish world today, Miguel de Unamuno, has written a book entitled, "The Agony of Christianity." He refers thereby not to the age-long struggle which Christianity has to wage for its very life, but to the elements of suffering and endurance in the Christian ideal and the Christian Gospel. Those elements, we recognize, are there. "As a lamb that is led to the slaughter and as a sheep that is before its shearers is dumb, so he opened not his mouth." But the Lamb of God was also the Lion of the Tribe of Judah. And the

surrender and submission of the Cross were followed by the shattering blow of the Resurrection, when He who had yielded up His soul unto death smote the power of the grave and broke the bars of death for ever more. The meekest and gentlest spirit that ever lived opened the doors of the morning and brought life and immortality to light for all mankind.

It is this dynamic and positive character of Christ which marks Him not as the surrenderer, but as the conqueror, not as "the Suffering Servant" only, but also as the Strong Son of God, which we miss in the traditional portraitures, but which we meet in the New Testament and which we need today, as in all days.

Assuredly we meet it in the New Testament. And we meet it there always in direct relationship and correction to the contrary impression. We see Him stooping humbly to wash His disciples' feet, only to hear Him rise and say, "Ye call me Master and Lord. Ye say well. I am." We see Him humiliated and insulted, with a crown of thorns and contemptuous derision, and we watch Him looking down upon it all as the Lord of truth and the King of men. It is thus that Christ confronts our time.

Let us make sure of this as the true historic account of Him. The Gospels assuredly sound uppermost the note of strength and competence and authority and power. How clearly we see and feel this in the Sermon on the Mount! Here is no timid, uncertain, inquiring voice, but One speaking "with authority," declaring His judgments against tradition and ancient custom, and asserting that the finality of destiny for men is in His hands. "And then I will profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity." And this is His tone throughout: "Bring him

to me." "Give ye them to eat." "I will; be thou clean." "Thy sins are forgiven thee." "Take up thy bed and walk." And at the end came two colossal assertions. "Father, I will." Regarding Himself it was, "Not my will, but thine, be done," but regarding His disciples: "Father, I will." And last, in the fulness of the consciousness of the power of His resurrection: "All authority hath been given unto me in heaven and on earth." Here throughout is no passive weakling, but the Master and Lord.

And ever He is seen as the powerful, character-moulding influence. No one influences Him, but no one touches Him and goes away the same. He asks no one's counsel, seeks help and light from no one; once He asks the support of His disciples' friendship, but they disappointed Him, and He meets His deep trial alone; He adapts Himself to no failures; He rearranges no plans: He knows His way, and He goes His way. He makes no changes and undergoes none. But He changes character or destiny for every one who touches Him. He takes vacillating and untrustworthy men and turns them to granite; doubters, and makes them certain unto martyrdom; a small group of men of no station, resource or consequence, and sends them out to overthrow empires and remake the world.

Always Jesus appeared as the dominating personality. In any company He was the overtopping figure. Throughout His whole ministry He was the master of all types and groups of men. And so also at the end. Under the Church of Ecce Homo on the Via Dolorosa in Jerusalem is the pavement of Pilate's Judgment Hall. The great stones were worn smooth centuries ago. On some of them the diagrams of the playing boards of the Roman soldiers' games are still plainly seen. It is one of

the best authenticated of the holy sites. One can easily reproduce the ancient scene as he stands on one of the very stones where Jesus may have stood. There are Pilate and the priests and the soldiers and the throng —all the authority of Church and state, and in the midst of them a lonely figure mocked at and scorned, clad in a cast-off purple robe with a reed sceptre and a thorny crown, standing rejected in the midst and about to be crucified. But who is the central and commanding figure, the Master and Lord? Not Roman governor nor Jewish high priest, but Jesus. The world which has eyes to see, sees this now. It feels with Charles Lamb in the familiar story: " Do you know the difference between Shakespeare and Christ? I will tell you. If Shakespeare were to come into this room with us we would all rise. If Christ should come, we would all kneel." This is the way that the ablest and most creative men of the modern world have felt about Him. If one were to pick out the three who have done most to create the new world in which we live, they would be Faraday in electricity, Pasteur in chemistry, and Kelvin in physics. All of them were simple Christian men. They would have risen to Shakespeare and knelt to Christ as their Master and Lord.

And yet, though Jesus was this masterful and authoritative figure, there was no harshness or violence. He was also meek and lowly in heart. This was the wonder of Him, that He combined so fully and perfectly all the qualities of a character that transcended perfection.

"But Thee, but Thee, O sovereign Seer of time,
But Thee, O poet's poet, Wisdom's Tongue,
But Thee, O man's best Man, O love's best Love,
O perfect life in perfect labour writ,

O all men's Comrade, Servant, King or Priest,—
What if or yet, what mole, what flaw, what lapse,
What least defect or shadow of defect,
What rumour, tattled by an enemy,
Of inference loose, what lack of grace
Even in torture's grasp, or sleep's or death's,—
Oh, what amiss may I forgive in Thee,
Jesus, good Paragon, Thou Crystal Christ?"

In Him all was in balance and proportion, service and mastery merged in one. It is all evident in this very scene of the Upper Room where Christ set forth so assuredly and commandingly His supremacy as Master and Lord. The disciples had come before Jesus to prepare the supper. Their first act should have been to wash their feet. The basin, the water and the towel were there. But they had been quarrelling again among themselves over the question of the chief place. Who should be first when Jesus was gone—or first in the new kingdom if it was at hand? No one was willing to yield his claim by stooping to serve the rest. Not Simon Peter. Had the Lord not definitely assured him at Cæsarea Philippi that the Church should be built on him? Not James and John. Had not their mother specifically bespoken the seats on the left and right hand of Christ for them? And how strong a claim Judas could make! Had he not been entrusted with the common purse and given charge of all the practical administration of their affairs? So they strove, and the atmosphere of the room was sullen and bitter with their contention when Jesus came. It was to be His last evening with them. He had such things to say to them as they had never heard. And they had prepared by selfish strife and heated ill-will. Jesus said nothing, but sat down, and they ate, with the disciples angry and

embittered. After supper, without a word, He arose and took the basin and the towel and began Himself to do for them what they had refused to do for one another. One can imagine the upsurge of shame and self-reproach in their hearts. "No, Lord," says Simon, "you must not. Give me the basin and the towel." "Not so," was the firm reply. "Well then, Lord," said the honest-hearted man, "wash my head with its evil thoughts and my impure heart. Forgive us and make us clean." This must have been what he meant. And the Lord stooped in humility to do for them the menial and self-abasing ministry. There was the lowliness and the meekness. Then He arose to His place. "Ye call me Master and Lord. Ye say well. Your Master and Lord I am."

"After all," said a well-known British scholar, head of one of the Oxford colleges, to a friend recently, "After all, we are asking a good deal of men when we bid them find the central meaning of life, the secret of the universe, in a man who was hanged." Yes, but that is only a part of the story. He was hanged. Without resistance He submitted to the shame and defeat of the Cross. As one from whom men hide their face, He was despised. When He was afflicted He opened not His mouth. But this was not all. He died, but He could not be holden of death. Death had no dominion over Him.

"Up from the grave He arose
With a mighty triumph o'er His foes.
He arose a victor from the dark domain,
And He lives for ever with His saints to reign.
He arose, hallelujah, Christ arose."

The Lord and Master of men is the Lord and Master of death and life.

Here, then, is the very Master we need in our modern world. This is our feeling, and this is our faith. But do we need a Master and Lord? Well, every man has one. Whatever our theory or protestation may be, there is no unmastered life. No more fatuous words were ever written than Henley's,

"I am the master of my fate;
I am the captain of my soul."

That is just what Henley was not. Nor is any man. We can be wreckers of our souls, but not their captains. Jesus knew that no man could serve either two masters or none. All that he could do was to choose his one master. Each human life does so tacitly or avowedly—money, power, pleasure, lust, ease, virtue, beauty, truth, honour, praise, service, glory, shame,—some lower or higher mastery or the one true Master and Lord.

Christ is still what He asserted that He was, and as such we need Him today. In two respects He was the kind of Lord and Master we need. He was the Master of evil. Many years ago, wide circulation was given gratuitously to an anonymous book entitled, "Not on Calvary." Its purpose was to show that the redeeming work of Christ was done, not on the Cross, but in the wilderness of the Temptation when He met the great typical forces of evil in their most dangerous forms and vanquished them. The fault of the book, as of so many of our statements, lay not in its affirmation, but in its denial. It represented only a partial truth. But the truth of Christ's victory over temptation is a real truth and essential truth. He had and exercised mastery over evil. "I saw Satan fall," He said. And He spoke to evil with the voice of authority. "Sin no more." He gave His disciples power and authority over all evil,

and it was no nominal and unused gift. They came back and reported to Him with amazed joy, "Lord, even the devils are subject unto us in thy name." And, last of all, as the ancient creed says, "He descended into hell." We may not know all the meaning of such words. But they illustrate the limitlessness of the love of God. "Though I make my bed in hell," says the Psalmist, "behold thou art there." And they represent the boundlessness of His power. He broke the bars of death and hell and came forth the conqueror, "The Veteran of Heaven," in Francis Thompson's verse:

"O Captain of the wars, whence won Ye so great scars?
In what fight did Ye smite, and what manner was the foe?
Was it on a day of rout they compassed Thee about,
Or gat Ye these adornings when Ye wrought their overthrow?

"'Twas on a day of rout they girded Me about,
They wounded all My brow, and they smote Me through the side;
My hand held no sword, when I met their armèd horde,
And the conqueror fell down, and the conquered bruised his pride!

"What is this unheard before, that the unarmèd make war,
And the slain hath the gain, and the victor hath the rout?
What wars, then, are these, and what the enemies,
Strange chief, with the scars of Thy conquest trenched about?

"The Prince I drave forth held the Mount of the North,
Girt with the guards of flame that roll around the pole.
I drave Him with my Wars from all his fortress-stars,
And the sea of death divided that My march might strike its goal.

"In the keep of Northern Guard, many a great demonian sword
Burns as it turns 'round the Mount occult, apart:
There is given power and place still for some certain days,
And his name would turn the Sun's blood back upon its heart.

"What is Thy Name? O show!—'My Name ye may not know;
'Tis a going forth with banners, and a baring of much swords:
But my titles that are high, are they not upon My thigh?
'King of Kings,' are the words, 'Lord of Lords;'
It is written, 'King of Kings, Lord of Lords.'"

He was not only Master of evil. He was Master also of storms. "And behold, there arose a great tempest in the sea, insomuch that the ship was covered with the waves; but he was asleep. And his disciples came to him, and awoke him, saying, Lord, save us: we perish. And he saith unto them, Why are ye fearful, O ye of little faith? Then he arose, and rebuked the winds and the sea; and there was a great calm." Nature and the disturbances of nature knew their Master's voice. And human nature and its tempests also stilled at His word. There is no more modern character in the Gospels than the man named "Legion"—not one, but many. How well we know this division and discord of personality, not two men only, but a score battling within us. "The Guardian Angel," "Elsie Venner," and two-thirds of modern fiction, and the doctrine of heredity, all illustrate the age-old truth of the seventh chapter of the Epistle to the Romans and of the man whose name was "Legion." And the Lord of angry waters was the Lord also of twisted men, "And they came to Jesus and be-

held him that was possessed with demons, sitting, clothed and in his right mind, even him that had the legion: and they were afraid." Christ was the Master of storms.

"Lord Christ came walking,
Walking on the sea;
All the little windswept waves
Leaping to His knee;
Lord Christ was beautiful
In His mastery.

"I would wait a thousand years,
Forfeiting delight,
Just to see the Lord Christ
Coming in the night,
Through the dim and clouded stars
Marvellously bright.

"And the hand that framed the spheres
Would be stretched to me.
Oh, in all the radiant night,
One face to see,—
Lord Christ, beautiful
In His majesty."

It is precisely in these regards that our modern life needs a Master, in the discernment and control of evil and in the reconciliation and peace of our conflict and unrest. We live among wrongs that should be righted —indolence, eating bread we have not earned, economic injustice, unfair distribution of wealth, greed and envy. Lines of moral distinction have been blurred. Doubt has arisen as to the existence of any absolute and objective ethical standards. And even when we see things as wrong we are unable to cope with them, to subdue evil tendencies in our own minds and wills, and to mas-

ter and defeat evil forces in society and life. And within and without we feel the deep distractions of our time. Our name, too, is Legion. We cannot adjust the old and the new. We can identify some of the conflicting forces which create the storm inside personality and some of those which make society, as the Hindu poet writes, " a battle not a brotherhood," but other forces we feel without being able to name them and the confusion and contest which they produce are beyond our power to tranquilize and subdue. If ever a generation struggling with evil and the denial of evil, distracted and bewildered, confused equally by its light and its darkness, needed a Master to give it freedom and sight, confidence and unity and peace, we are that generation. From being alike contenders and the sport of the contention of many powers for supremacy, we need to have our feet washed and our spirits cleansed and to hear again the ancient voice, " I am your Master and Lord."

And our day needs to note the unequivocal and unconditioned affirmation: " I am Master and Lord." Not, " I will be." Not, " If you do so and so; if you acknowledge me, I will become your Lord and Master." But, " I am." That is the simple moral fact. Paul boldly declares it in a passage which is too strong for all our theologies: " The head of every man is Christ." The Calvinists would say, " Christ is the head of every man of whom He chooses to be the head." The Arminians would say, " Christ is the head of every man who chooses Christ for his head." But Paul is very bold: " Christ is the head of every man." He has been and is the Lord of life and history. One of our modern and transitory reviews recently poured much derision on a great book of a generation ago, Dr. Storrs' " The Divine Origin of Christianity Indicated by Its Historical

Effects," on the ground of its erroneous estimate of the real influence of Christ on humanity. Dr. Storrs' book was a solid and adequately documented study of the facts and will stand long after the reviewer of yesterday afternoon has gone by. No doubt there has been rebellion enough in history against the moral mastery of Christ, but the rebellion itself has been a recognition of the fact of authority. Accepted or denied that authority is there and gives explanation to the whole process. Either men have obeyed their Master and lived toward the truth of things, or they have denied Him and " gone to their own place." " In all my study of the ancient times," said Johann von Müller, who once took up accidentally the New Testament and found Christ the explanation of history, " I have always felt the want of something. And it was not until I knew our Lord that all was clear to me; with Him there is nothing that I am not able to solve."

And so of individual lives as of history. Jesus Christ is every man's Master and Lord. We do not make Him such by faith and we do not unmake Him by unbelief. We may live in repudiation and rebellion, but we cannot destroy the central moral reality of Christ's character and place. He is the Son of God and the Son of Man. He is the light of God's glory and " the very image of his substance." We may deny our Master, but we cannot un-master Him. He is the true centre of human fellowship. He is the meaning and goal of life. He is the revelation and essence of God as all goodness and truth and love and as Father and King. Christ is all this. We may impoverish ourselves and frustrate and postpone the fulness of human life and the full coming of Christ's Kingdom by rejecting it, but Christ is still what He is. Truth and the Truth are truth. We

cannot untruth them. We can only untruth ourselves by failing to recognize them. Jesus Christ is Master and Lord. Our need, as persons and society, is to acknowledge and accept and live by the glorious and adequate fact.

On the last night of Dr. John Kelman's stay in America, where he so richly served Christ and His Church, I heard him recount the story of his years among us. Of all his experiences, he said one stood out above the rest, and it came to him on his way to New York to take up the pastorate of the Fifth Avenue Church. He had as a fellow passenger the late Dr. Matthew D. Mann, of Buffalo, the famous surgeon who did all that human skill could do to save Mr. McKinley's life after his assassination. I knew Dr. Mann as a dear friend for many years. He was a great fisherman, and he was a devout but very reticent Christian, with a deep love which he found it hard to disclose. Dr. Kelman said that each evening he and Dr. Mann met on the upper deck in a quiet spot behind one of the lifeboats and talked together. Night by night Dr. Mann opened wider his inner heart as they discussed together our sad and divided and weary world. On the last evening, at length Dr. Mann burst forth, " I will tell you, Dr. Kelman, what we need. We need an Emperor. The world needs an Emperor." "An Emperor," Dr. Kelman replied, " for our democratic world? " " Yes," answered Dr. Mann, " an Emperor? And I will tell you His Name; His Name is Jesus Christ. There is no hope until we make Him Emperor."

And this conception of Christ as Lord and Master of the grade of Emperor is not unscriptural. In three passages in the New Testament there occurs a Greek word which is translated " Master " or " Lord," in our English

versions, but of which the modern equivalent is more appropriately just the word which Dr. Mann used. One is in Paul's Second Epistle to Timothy, where he speaks of a man as a vessel "unto honour, sanctified, meet for the Emperor's use." Another is in II Peter ii, 1, in the warning against false teachers, "denying even the Emperor that bought them." And the third is in Jude's reference to ungodly men who deny "our only Emperor and Lord Jesus Christ."

We not only need such a Master, we have one. It remains only for us loyally to acknowledge Him and faithfully to serve and follow Him.

VIII

THE ALLEGED NARROWNESS OF CHRISTIANITY

ONE of the most common ideas which we meet in present-day conversation is the alleged narrowness of religion, and especially of the Christian religion. Indeed, it is regarded as an evidence of broad-mindedness if one is interested in Buddhism or Vedantism or Bahaism, but to be a Christian, and especially to be in earnest about it, is a sign of narrow-mindedness. At a meeting in connection with one of our best known philanthropies recently one speaker urged that the larger part of the contributions had been made by Christian people on representations by the agency concerned with regard to the religious character of its work and with the clear understanding on the part of the donors that their religious purpose would be faithfully observed, and the speaker argued that there should be the honourable fulfilment of this trust in all future plans. Some of those present thought this attitude of insistence on a distinct religious and Christian purpose and effort in a great human philanthropy, which was saving human life and providing useful education for its beneficiaries, evidenced a want of broad-mindedness. It is deemed broad-minded to include social interest, education, ministry to physical need, co-operation with secular governmental programmes of betterment and advance, but to include religion is

" narrow." What a strange perversion of ideas this is! One would suppose broad-mindedness involved the inclusion of the broadest range of interests and endeavours, and that narrow-mindedness lay in excluding any human concern, especially the vital and fundamental concern of religion. But the common idea stands on its head in this matter. Foreign missions are the broadest enterprise in the world. They carry on more education, more philanthropy, more medical service, more study of languages and production of literature than any other single movement in the world, but because they are fundamentally and essentially religious and have for their supreme aim the propagation of Christianity and the winning of men and women to Christian faith and discipleship, and the establishment of the Christian Church, they are regarded as narrow, and their advocates and agents as either slightly or extremely fanatical.

And this current notion seems to relate itself specially to evangelical Christianity. Men will speak tolerantly of liberalistic Christianity or of institutional or sacerdotal or prelatical or Papal religion, or of the use of religion as a force to control the ignorant, but evangelical Christianity, with its clear doctrinal convictions and its warm religious experience, is narrow.

Now let us at once recognize that there is an element of truth in this view. Truth is narrow and exclusive. All truth is so. The search for it, whether in science or religion, involves the rejection of every false and untenable hypothesis. No lie is of the truth. The range of falsehood and untruth is exceeding broad. There may be a thousand lies about a matter regarding which the truth is single. A million crooked lines may be drawn between two points, but only one line straight and true.

And truth is narrow morally. There are things that

are barred. Christianity is too narrow to allow room for lust and greed and evil. Our Lord spoke unequivocally of a straight gate and a narrow way leading to life, and of a wide gate and a broad way " that leadeth to destruction, and many are they that enter in thereby." Paul enjoined conversational limits that narrowed the field of allowable table talk by excluding immorality and uncleanness. Would " broad-mindedness " object to such narrowness? And Paul had stern notions of companionship, too. He mixed with all men and adapted himself to all " that I may by all means save some," but he was dead against the broadness of indiscriminate and all-inclusive fellowship: " Come out from among them and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch no unclean thing." And heaven, though it be comprehensive and inclusive beyond our conception, is too narrow for murderers and fornicators and idolaters and liars.

John Bunyan wrote of all this in his homely, vivid way in " Grace Abounding ":

"About this time, the state and happiness of these poor people at Bedford was thus, in a kind of Vision, presented to me: I saw, as if they were set on the Sunny side of some high Mountain, there refreshing themselves with the pleasant beams of the Sun, while I was shivering and shrinking in the Cold, afflicted with Frost, Snow, and dark Clouds. Methought, also, betwixt me and them, I saw a wall that did compass about this mountain; now, through this wall my soul did greatly desire to pass; concluding, that if I could, I would go even into the very midst of them, and there also comfort myself with the heat of their Sun.

"About this wall I thought myself to go again and again, still prying as I went, to see if I could find some way or

passage, by which I might enter therein; but none could I find for some time. At the last, I saw, as it were, a narrow gap, like a little doorway in the Wall, through which I attempted to pass; Now the passage being very strait and narrow, I made many offers to get in, but all in Vain, even until I was wellnigh quite beat out, by striving to get in. At last, with great striving, methought I at first did get in my head, and after that, by a sidling striving, my Shoulders and my whole Body. Then was I exceeding glad, and went and sat down in the midst of them, and so was comforted with the light and heat of their Sun.

" Now, this Mountain and Wall, etc., was thus made out to me—the Mountain signified the Church of the living God; the Sun that shone thereon, the comfortable shining of his merciful Face on them that were therein; the Wall, I thought, was the word that did make separation between the Christians and the World; and the Gap which was in this Wall, I thought, was Jesus Christ, who is the way to God the Father. But forasmuch as the Passage was wonderful narrow, even so narrow, that I could not, but with great difficulty, enter in thereat, it showed me that none could enter into Life, but those that were in downright earnest, and unless also they left this wicked World behind them; for here was only room for Body and Soul, but not for Body and Soul, and Sin."

Christians will accept and bear the reproach of such narrowness. They believe that truth and principle matter, and that they have limits which exclude all that is false and wrong.

But religion is not the only narrowness in the world. There are other narrownesses which are more throttling and impoverishing than religion. There is business, for example. Many years ago, in one of the largest churches in New York, there might have been seen every Sunday morning a distinguished looking man in the congrega-

tion wrapped apparently in reverent meditation. No such thing. He was thinking of life insurance. He was the founder and president of one of our greatest insurance companies, and he confessed to a friend that he found it impossible to listen to a sermon or indeed to any address. His mind was capable of only one set of activities, and he sat all through church, prayers, hymns and sermon, planning new and more alluring forms of life insurance. There are men so absolutely absorbed and mastered by business that they are simply dead to everything else. And these are the very men most prone to talk of "broadness" and to inveigh against the narrowness of religion.

The quest of money is one of the most narrowing of all life's pursuits. By many, thank God, money is sought and valued solely as a means and instrument of worthy use—for human service, for art, for widening the bounds of knowledge and of life. But others seek it only for itself or for its selfish use in buying toys or pleasure or virtue or vice. Could there be a more imprisoning and degrading narrowness than this? Some years ago one of our great railroad builders and capitalists, who had slept through a missionary address, came up at the close to see some photographs of China and the Chinese people. He was a "self-made man," and his comment was, "Ain't they queer looking folks?" And Sir James Ewing, or Sir William Miller, or Sir William Wanless, or Nevius, or Verbeck, or Livingstone would have been regarded by him also as a little queer and narrow-minded. How could any really broad-minded person be a missionary?

And let no one suppose that science is so certainly broadening. The famous instance of Darwin and the atrophy of his sense of music suffices for illustration,

though it can be duplicated indefinitely. But this was not the only narrowness of a great scientific mind. He wrote to Hooker, " I am not sure whether it would not be wisest for scientific men just to ignore the whole subject of religion." Again to Hooker he writes, " It is poetry, and can I say anything more severe? " And to John Morley he admits his deficient historic spirit and his " ignorance in this line " (" More Letters of Charles Darwin," Vol. I, pp. 309, 317, 326). And his interpretation of the Civil War, in a letter to Hooker, in 1862, illustrates this incapacity for historic judgment and shows how narrow a broad-minded scientist can be. " You will see," he writes, " how the loss of the power of bullying is in fact the sore loss to the man of the North from disunion " (p. 214).

And if any one wants a still more vivid illustration of the narrowness of boasted broad-mindedness he can find it in the militaristic temper and the pseudo-patriotism of ultra-nationalism, accusing of fanaticism and pacifism those who believe in the possibility of a peaceful and constructive and harmonious solution of the problems of inter-racial and inter-national relationships. What can be more ludicrous than separatists accusing of narrowness the men who are trying to deal, with breadth and reality, with all the economic and social problems of all mankind, perceiving that policies of division and competition and conflict are no longer rational or possible in the real world with which we have to deal. In this real world the only broad view is the Christian view.

It is thus that we meet the idea of the narrowness of Christianity, not by counter-charges, but by flat denial and the direct assertion of the truth that Christianity is the expansion and enlargement of life. It is Christianity itself which proposes that religion and every other

ideal should be judged by comparative measurements. John says that in his vision: "There was given me a reed like unto a rod: and one said, Rise, and measure the temple of God, and the altar, and them that worship therein." There is an old story of a painter who leaned over the easel of a student whose work showed power but was cramped and drawn in, and wrote over it, "Amplius," "wider." That is the Bible's view of the call and experience of religion:

"Answer me when I call,
O God of my righteousness;
Thou hast set me at large when I was in distress."
"Thou hast enlarged my steps under me."

And this was Paul's distinct conception of Christianity. It was an emancipation. "Now for a recompense in like kind (I speak as unto my children), be ye also enlarged." The word which he uses means, literally, "to make broad." "Be broadened," is his summons. Consider what a broadening and enlarging power the Christian faith had been to him. He had grown up, as he said, "after the straitest sect of our religion," "a Pharisee of the Pharisees." On four occasions he recalls the narrow, persecuting zeal which had marked him. And always, apparently, the memory of his part in Stephen's martyrdom remained with him. His mind had moved wholly within the legalism and ethnic provincialism of the Pharisees. And then he became a Christian and a totally new man, and called others to share his enlargement. "If any man is in Christ, he is a new creature; the old things are passed away, behold they are become new." He thought now in terms of all humanity. The whole world and all history became for him the actual working ideas of his mind and the field of his influence. He

expanded into the greatest force of his time and, with the exception of Christ, of all times. Those who call him narrow, today, are men and women who have never grasped his ideas or felt the surge of the mighty, moulding forces which controlled him. He is still far ahead of the modern world. And its most daring moral and spiritual advances are but timid outreachings toward his massive and courageous and far-seeing conceptions.

We assert then the essential character of Christianity as an emancipation, an enlargement of thought and life. It is an intellectual enlargement. It teaches us to read history in the large with the perspective of the ages and maps of the world. It deals with the ideas of development and the fulness of time. The Bible is the tale of the divine education of man from the beginnings of his life, and it unfolds a future vaster than his bravest dreams. Christianity relates all life to a rational meaning and offers a spiritual solution to all its problems except the problem of the origin of evil and the problem of suffering and pain, and it gives us all the light which we seem able to receive on these mysteries of our experience. So Browning:

> *"I say the acknowledgment of God in Christ,*
> *Accepted by reason, solves for thee*
> *All questions in the earth and out of it,*
> *And has so far advanced thee to be wise."*

No book has ever exercised so deep and wide an enlarging influence as the Bible. It has provided an education for multitudes, surpassing the education of the schools. It has taught them the noblest use of the English language. I knew long ago a puddler in the steel mills at Coatesville, Pennsylvania, who had never attended school, who had learned to read from the

Bible, who knew nothing of other books and had never been in contact with professional and self-defined culture, but whose use of English, especially in prayer, was an inspiration, and whose mind was expanded by the great ideas of the prophets and evangelists and apostles so that he moved on a loftier level than common men, who turned from his narrowness to the "breadth" of the daily newspaper with its ephemeral localism. The translation of the Bible into a language is equivalent, as Dr. Barrows once declared, to building a railroad through the national intellect, so enormously does it increase traffic and communication and contact.

And the Bible and the Christian revelation are enlarging because of the truths which they set forth about the world and destiny, but most of all about God. The God of the New Testament is the noblest thought that men's minds can apprehend. "The conception of God with which Christianity addresses the world," said Dr. William Newton Clark, "is the best that man can form or entertain." We think of Him in the richest and greatest terms of which we are capable, and then we say, "Now God is greater than that. He is better than our best thought about Him." And we are summoned to press on to an infinite enlargement of our understanding of Him. We are to grow forever "in the grace and knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." Psalmist and prophet also had been given this vision. "We will walk in the name of Jehovah our God for ever and ever." We are called to a limitless pursuit of the knowledge of God and of the meaning of all things in Him, and of the wonder of His works and His ways and His world.

The Christian doctrine of intercessory prayer involves an enlargement of intellectual sympathy and

social imagination. One who believes in the reality of such prayer and practices it with Christian conscience must enter into the life of the world with intelligent understanding. I recall two instances of special revelation of this immensely expansive influence on the human mind and outlook. Once at a little gathering in a Western city I heard a man from Kansas, George S. Fisher, survey the world in prayer in a way that would have dumbfounded those who identify a belief in intercessory prayer with a narrow fanaticism. And again, at one of the Student Conferences at Northfield in the early years, John Sparhawk, a Philadelphia lawyer, called upon suddenly for a Fourth of July address, swept that student audience through such a penetrating analysis of the personalities and forces of the whole world's life as left it amazed. The Christian faith had given those men a large commanding outlook on humanity.

And just as Christianity is a widening intellectual influence, so also the moral ideals of Christianity have the same largeness to them. The Psalmist's word, "Thy commandment is exceeding broad," is true both of the restraints and of the freedoms of Christianity. It is true of the restraints. There are assuredly the most definite ethical restraints in the Christian life, but so also are there in all true and fine art. Browning's poetry, with all its disregard of form and custom, is far more under restraint than the contemporary *vers libre,* or literature of the "Elmer Gantry" type, just as Phidias on the Parthenon worked under limits and rigid laws unknown to a boy artist carving an obscene figure out of rancid soap. There are many things which are simply intolerable and inadmissible in the Christian spirit. God is all truth and purity, and Christianity can allow no room whatsoever to lies or uncleanness.

Sometimes Christian zeal may draw the lines with unusual sharpness, but if so it is better than to let down the high and brave ideals. Keith Falconer, as a boy of seventeen, illustrates the natural, uncompromising rebound of a lad in the first eagerness of a whole-hearted consecration. In a letter to a friend, in 1873, from Harrow, he wrote: "I must say something about Jesus Christ, because I think He ought never to be left out; and that is the fault I find with parties, and balls, and theatres: Jesus Christ, who is the All in All, is utterly left out. It seems very curious, when one comes to think about it, what power the devil has over people, has not He? But that will not always be so—Lord, hasten the time when Thou shalt reign altogether, and when Thy servants shall serve Thee, and Thy name shall be upon their foreheads, and when they shall see Thy face, for Jesus' sake."

"Very narrow," says the world of men. Well, a broad narrowness is better than a narrow breadth.

And if Christianity is stern in its restraints it is marked no less by its rich moral freedom. Its principle is embodied in one of Horace Bushnell's great sermons, "Free to amusements and too free to want them." And with what weight and force does Paul set forth the freedom of the Gospel! "Know ye not, that to whom ye yield yourselves as servants unto obedience, his servants ye are whom ye obey; whether of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness? But thanks be to God, that whereas ye were the servants of sin, ye became obedient from the heart to that form of teaching whereunto ye were delivered; and being made free from sin, ye became the servants of righteousness. I speak after the manner of men because of the infirmity of your flesh: for as ye presented your members as ser-

vants to uncleanness and to iniquity, even so now present your members as servants of righteousness unto sanctification. For when ye were servants of sin, ye were free in righteousness. What fruit then had ye at that time in the things whereof ye are now ashamed? for the end of those things is death. But now being made free from sin, and become servants to God, ye have your fruit unto sanctification, and the end eternal life. For the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life in Christ Jesus our Lord" (Rom. vi, 16-23). "So then, brethren, we are debtors, not to the flesh, to live after the flesh: for if ye live after the flesh, ye must die: but if by the Spirit ye put to death the deeds of the body, ye shall live. For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God. For ye received not the spirit of bondage unto fear; but ye received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father. The Spirit himself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are children of God: and if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ; if so be that we suffer with him, that we may be also glorified with him." "The creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God" (Rom. viii, 12-17, 21). "For freedom did Christ set us free: stand fast therefore, and be not entangled again in a yoke of bondage" (Gal. v, 1).

Our old Christian hymns are true to the New Testament and to the facts of Christian experience:

"He breaks the power of cancelled sin.
He sets the sinner free."

Christ is the truth which makes men free. The life which He gives them is a full and free life.

And furthermore, the aim of Christianity is character, pure, glorious and free. Indeed, in many New Testament passages the word "glory," as Caspar Wistar Hodge used to teach, means "character." Often the glory of God is simply the character of God: "Seeing it is God that said, Light shall shine out of darkness, who shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ" (II Cor. iv, 6). And glory for us involves character: "We all, with unveiled face beholding as in a mirror the glory of the Lord are transformed into the same image from glory to glory, even as from the Lord the Spirit" (II Cor. iii, 18). "Christ in you, the hope of glory; whom we proclaim, admonishing every man and teaching every man in all wisdom, that we may present every man perfect in Christ" (Col. i, 27-28). Paul contemplates an endless growth into the character of Christ as the end of Christian faith. "I press toward the goal unto the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus" (Phil. iii, 14). "Till we all attain unto the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a fullgrown man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ: that we may be no longer children, tossed to and fro and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men in craftiness, after the wiles of error: but speaking truth in love, may grow up in all things into him, who is the head, even Christ; from whom all the body fitly framed and knit together through that which every joint supplieth, according to the working in due measure of each several part, maketh the increase of the body unto the building up of itself in love" (Eph. iv, 13-16). And it is of this that the poets write. Oliver Wendell Holmes, in "The Chambered Nautilus":

"Build thee more stately mansions, O my soul,
As the swift seasons roll!
Leave thy low-vaulted past!
Let each new temple, nobler than the last,
Shut thee from heaven with a dome more vast,
Till thou at length art free,
Leaving thine outgrown shell by life's unresting sea."

And Sidney Lanier, in " The Marshes of Glynn ":

"As the marsh-hen secretly builds on the watery sod,
Behold I will build me a nest on the greatness of God:
I will fly in the greatness of God as the marsh-hen flies
In the freedom that fills all the space twixt marsh and skies:
By so many roots as the marsh-grass sends in the sod
I will heartily lay me ahold on the greatness of God."

Christianity is also the greatest enlarger of sympathies. Its ideal of friendship, as Henry Clay Trumbull showed, fulfils and transcends all other ideals. It began with a transcendent and supernatural love and sacrifice. " Herein was the love of God manifested in us that God hath sent his only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him. Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins " (I John iv, 9, 10). And Paul followed in the footsteps of the love of Christ. The most charming feature of his story is his affectionateness and the noble and transforming friendships which he established all along his way.

"Hearts I have won of sister or of brother,
Quick on the earth or hidden in the sod.
Lo, every heart awaiteth me, another
Friend in the blameless family of God."

But the love which Christianity generated was not of friend for friend only. Christ Himself demanded that

it should go far beyond this. "Ye have heard that it was said, Thou shalt love thy neighbour, and hate thine enemy; but I say unto you, Love your enemies, and pray for them that persecute you; that ye may be sons of your Father who is in heaven: for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sendeth rain on the just and the unjust. For if ye love them that love you, what reward have ye? do not even the publicans the same? And if ye salute your brethren only, what do ye more than others? do not even the Gentiles the same? Ye therefore shall be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect" (Matt. v, 43-48). And He Himself thus loved: "But God commendeth his own love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us" (Rom. v, 8). And in all ages and today Christianity is the great philanthropy. Its disciples are the bridgers of the gulfs between the nations and the races. They go by the ten thousand as missionaries to all human need. It were an easy thing to produce the illustrations of its enlarged sympathies. Let us be content with one from individual life and one from institutional service. For many years there lived in a beautiful old manor house in central Pennsylvania two old maiden sisters. Their father had come from Colerain, Ireland, and established an iron forge in the eastern foothills of the Alleghenies. After a prosperous life he died, and in time new processes and new regions destroyed the old forges. His two daughters lived on in the old home. Two brooks met at the corner of the estate. A row of tall pines lined one of the brooks as it ran past the old formal garden, with the flower-beds divided by the cropped box hedges, on which the library windows looked down. On the library table lay the latest books about far away lands and peoples, and these two women

in their secluded country home, far away from the nearest railway, lived a life in the midst of all the vast movement of humanity. Like Terence, all that concerned mankind was of interest to them. Christianity was to them and in their minds and hearts like the Marshes of Glynn, all " candid and simple and nothing-withholding and free."

As to institutions, what others can compare in our world today with the agencies due to the Christian spirit? The Red Cross operates the world around under a Christian symbol. The Near East Relief, the largest single temporary philanthropy of our day, grew straight out of the Christian missionary enterprise, and two-thirds of its contributions were from the people of the churches. Where are the famine relief funds provided and where do the great ministries of human service arise? Always from Christians and from among Christian men.

But it is charged that Christianity is the great intolerance, the fountain of all wars. That is not true. Intolerance has sometimes cloaked itself in Christian guise, as hypocrisy loves to do, and nationalism or factionalism or ambition or bigotry has sought to use Christianity to defend its misdoings, and wrong, which was meeting its penalty, has railed at justice. Christians have failed to be true to their faith. They have often misunderstood and often misrepresented it. But Christianity is love and truth, and hate and error fear it, and by any means, use or abuse, will seek to compromise and destroy it. But God abideth love and faithfulness.

"And the love of God is broader than the measure of man's mind,
And the heart of the eternal is most wonderfully kind.

If our hearts were but more simple, we would take
Him at His word,
And our lives would be all sunshine in the sweetness
of our Lord."

And not our lives only, but the world's life, if it would come away from its narrow ignorance and selfishness to the broad love of God.

Lastly, Christianity is a religion of power. What power man already has, it intensifies and expands, and it brings with it new power, power to conquer evil, power to achieve good. It brought this power to David Livingstone, as "Punch" recognized in the poem in which, after his death, it did justice to his memory:

"Droop, half-mast colours, bow, bareheaded crowds,
As this plain coffin o'er the side is slung,
To pass by woods of masts and ratlined shrouds,
As erst by Afric's trunks, liana-hung.

"'Tis the last mile of many thousands trod
With failing strength, but never-failing will,
By the worn frame, now at its rest with God,
That never rested from its fight with ill.

"Or if the ache of travel and of toil
Would sometimes wring a short, sharp cry of pain
From agony of fever, blain, and boil,
'Twas but to crush it down and on again!

"He knew not that the trumpet he had blown
Out of the darkness of that dismal land,
Had reached and roused an army of its own
To strike the chains from the slave's fettered hand.

"Now we believe, he knows, sees all is well;
How God has stayed his will and shaped his way,
To bring the light to those that darkling dwell
With gains that life's devotion will repay.

"Open the Abbey doors and bear him in
To sleep with king and statesman, chief and sage,
The missionary come of weaver-kin,
But great by work that brooks no lower wage.

"He needs no epitaph to guard a name
Which men shall prize while worthy work is known;
He lived and died for good—be that his fame:
Let marble crumble: this is Living—stone."

There are many new powers in Christianity, the power of God (II Cor. vi, 7; xiii, 4), the power of Christ (II Cor. xii, 9; I Cor. v, 14), the power of the Resurrection (Phil. iii, 10), the power of the Holy Spirit (Rom. xv, 13), power from on high (Luke xxiv, 49), the power of an endless life (Heb. vii, 16). To all this, and more than this, the Gospel of Christ calls men. It is a call to the largest, most abundant and eternal life. It opens to those who respond the gates of God and shows the infinite glorious beyond and all the fulness of God's sufficiency available for our insufficiency now.

"And I smiled to thing God's goodness flowed around
our incompleteness,
Round our restlessness His rest."

What could be broader than the "narrowness" of faith that believes this and enters into it? Of those who have come to this faith and to whom it has come it is to be said, as was said of Theodore Munger:

"He has found life's freedom, breadth and length,
And breathes with vigours of eternal breath."

IX

THE LIMITS OF TOLERANCE

WHAT are the principles of fellowship for those who hold such views as these? There are two fields, out of many, in which we may specially study the questions of the limits of tolerance and of the conditions of co-operation and of attitude toward those from whom we differ. Those two fields are the foreign mission field and the practice of Jesus.

In the mission field the problem is real and difficult. It is real. Already in several fields organizations have been formed, such as the Bible Union in China, to unite those who believe that on doctrinal grounds they should separate themselves from others and to oppose co-operation and union except on the basis of agreement in the convictions laid down in the constitution of these organizations. And in other fields where no formal organizations have been set up the problem is none the less real as to what basis of doctrinal agreement, if any, is essential. In former days the doctrinal views of foreign missionaries were so far uniform and accordant, so it is said, that it could be assumed that common action was possible, so far as doctrinal opinion was concerned, without risk of friction or conflict. But now the rift between conservative and modernist opinion is said to be so wide and so widely prevalent on the mission field, that the question of more co-operation or of the continuance of old co-operation is an open and real issue.

The problem is also difficult. It is made difficult by

our human frailties, by the confusion of prejudice with conviction, by partisan temper, by mutual misapprehensions, by careless and unguarded speech, by the inadequacy of language in the sphere of truth which is beyond language. But apart from all elements of personal difficulty, the problem is perplexing as a problem of principle, or indeed rather as a double problem of principle: How much doctrinal agreement is necessary to Christian fellowship, or what are the limits of tolerance; and how much doctrinal agreement is necessary to common organic action, or what are the limits of co-operation?

Before attempting to answer these questions, the writer of these words ought perhaps, in order to avoid all misunderstanding, to state his own point of view. He accepts the whole of Christianity as set forth in the New Testament. He believes unqualifiedly every article of the Apostles' Creed. No language is adequate to state his conception of Christ. He believes that He is more and greater than any words can ever express, " the Word made flesh," God incarnate, reconciling the world to Himself, the only Saviour, our Lord and our God. He believes in the truthfulness of the record of Christ's life, including His miracles, and rejoices with great joy in the miracles of the Virgin Birth and of the real Resurrection of Christ and of His future, personal advent. He believes that it is God alone who through Christ saves men, not by their characters, nor by any works of righteousness which they can do, but by His own grace through the death and life of His dear Son. As to the Bible, he accepts the doctrine of the Westminster Confession and regards its authority as supreme, not in faith only but also in the practice, conduct and relations of men. I am afraid this may seem

to many very antiquated and unmodern, and the writer must be prepared to accept whatever limitations of value in the modern mind such views set upon his judgment as to the doctrinal limits of tolerance and the doctrinal basis of co-operation.

One suffers from a second limitation also which conservative friends may view with disfavour, though they ought to feel kindly toward it. It is the limitation involved in an effort to see the problem in the light of our actual historic experience in the foreign missionary enterprise. The problems of tolerance and co-operation are not new. The Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles of St. Paul are full of them. They appeared on the very threshold of modern missions. Adoniram Judson withdrew from the American Board, when, on his journey to India, he was led conscientiously to adopt the immersionist views of baptism. A divergence of opinion on this one point of the meaning and form of one of the sacraments seemed to those godly men a barrier in the way of co-operation and union. A divergence of conviction as to the polity of the Church or as to the nature of the ministry and of the sacraments, one or both, has been deemed and is deemed still by others an impediment to union and to some forms of co-operation. From the beginning and today creedal differences compel great bodies of Christians to hold aloof from co-operative commitments with those whose mode of conceiving the truth of Christianity is different, but toward whom, nevertheless, they feel the most brotherly goodwill. I may cite, for example, the thoughtful statement of the position of the United Lutheran Church of America, by Professor J. L. Neve, D.D. He is setting forth the confessional difficulties in the way of a closer relationship of the Lutheran and Reformed Churches in America:

"When we speak of the 'Reformed group' of churches in our country we have in mind, first of all, the German Reformed and the Dutch Reformed Churches in America, and then the Presbyterians and the Congregationalists on this side of the Atlantic. And in a derived sense, although subject to qualification, we count into this group also the Methodists and Baptists of many names, also the Quakers and other like Churches. These last mentioned are all in one sense or another daughters of the Reformed Church. The point on which the Swiss reformers differed fundamentally from Luther pertained to the whole conception of the means of grace—a difference which was defended on the basis of a differing conception of the person of Christ and on the ground of a special philosophy regarding the relation of the divine to the human nature in Christ, concerning the word and the earthly and heavenly element in Baptism and in the Lord's Supper. These basic differences, again, function in such a way that wider circles of differences are drawn, which include the doctrine of predestination, the conception of the Church and the Kingdom of God, and the relation of Church and state. Practically all Churches belonging to the Federal Council reject the Lutheran conception of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, and in connection therewith what the Lutheran Church teaches regarding the mode of the Holy Spirit's work upon the hearts of men. Some, again, have specific denominational peculiarities, the Baptists their demand of adult baptism, the Quakers their insistency upon the immediacy of grace, the Methodists their subjectivism in the emphasis upon conversion.

"But all these special tenets can easily be shown to represent special traits of the Reformed Church, which have been made the occasion for sectarian developments. We should fail entirely in a reliable consideration of our question, at least with regard to the chief branches of the Reformed Church group, if we should persuade ourselves to believe that there is a close relation between them and the Lutheran Church. With some of them, as for instance with

the Presbyterians, there may be a certain alikeness in temper, in the appreciation of theological science, in the quiet working for spiritual results. But when all this has been said, the fact remains that the German Reformed, the Dutch Reformed, the Presbyterians and the Congregationalists belong to a camp of Protestantism which is doctrinally and practically established against the teachings and the church life of Lutheranism. Between the two sides there stands a different comprehension of the Gospel, which produces a different piety, a different church life. That their conceptions of the relation of law and Gospel, of state and Church are not the same we see in the characteristic differences between 'social service' among the Reformed Churches and the 'Inner Missions' as practised by the Lutheran Church. Even in the points of seeming agreement there is noticeable everywhere the 'other spirit' of which Luther spoke to Zwingli at Marburg, and which is the natural result from a conflicting comprehension of the Gospel.

"I have no desire to exaggerate. But we are discussing the question whether the Lutheran Church can step into corporate, organic union with an organization which represents the group of the Reformed Churches of American Protestantism. It is my conviction that the Lutheran Church cannot enter into a corporate relation with such an organization without denying her own genius, her own life."

I have made this long quotation to show how much more complicated and more living the whole issue is than in some of our present-day discussions we seem to realize.

If we were to attempt to deal at all adequately with the problem of this chapter, a full study of the history of our missionary relationships should be undertaken to ascertain what have been in the past the principles governing our practice of tolerance and our achievements in co-operation, and wherein we had in fact discovered

limitations in the one case and barriers in the other. This cannot be undertaken here. I venture simply to suggest some of the generalized conclusions to which such a study of the past might probably lead.

1. Thus far and today, for organic Church unity a clear measure of agreement has been found necessary; (a) as to fundamental doctrine and (b) as to Church polity and organization. The nature and meaning of the sacraments might be added as a third element, but organic unity has been achieved without any statement on this third point, as in the Church of Christ in Japan and in the United Church of Southern India. In these cases, however, it was possible to take for granted a tacit agreement in this matter, which would no doubt have to be made explicit in the case of the union of Churches holding divergent views. These unions, however, like the union of Methodist Churches in Japan and of Episcopal Churches in Japan and China, are all kindred groups. The problem remains to be worked out as to what agreement in doctrine and polity is requisite to the union of bodies of different faith and order.

2. In the second place, we learn from the history of missions that co-operation short of organic church unity has been found possible wherever the members involved trusted one another as fellow-Christians and possessed the agreement of view essential to the co-operative conduct of the particular work involved. Baptists, Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Methodists and Disciples have founded and maintained union hospitals, theological and agricultural schools and mission presses. Anglican, Baptist, Lutheran, Congregational, Presbyterian, Reformed and Methodist Churches unite in college and medical education for men and women. Presbyterians, Methodists, Congregationalists and Bap-

tists unite in a common treasurer's organization in Shanghai. Such co-operative enterprises can be cited by the score. Any institution whose work does not involve divisive doctrinal issues, it would seem, might as truly be a co-operative undertaking, provided the co-operators trust one another as fellow-Christians, as that those parties should go out to China or to India on the same steamship. People of different views co-operate in politics, or in extinguishing a fire, or in maintaining a mutual life insurance society, or in developing a sanitarium. To the extent that the requirements of co-operation in any line of human action can be met, men can and ought to act together. All the more, let me say it again, if they trust one another as fellow-Christians.

Obviously there are two questions here. One of them belongs to this second inquiry and the third is the last of the three generalizations I am presenting. The question which belongs here is how much agreement in doctrinal belief and statement is necessary in the case of colleges or other schools, of literature societies and of co-operative committees and councils which are of necessity presenting Christian truth in institutional attitude or influence or deliverance, or in the classroom or in the printed page, or which are bound to represent in the fulfilment of their duties some view of the nature and teaching of the Christian faith.

What can any one do here but state his own conviction? The conviction of the writer of this volume is that in our co-operative missionary undertakings and associations identity of opinion on the whole body of Christian doctrine is not requisite; that in many matters a diversity of view which assures a fuller apprehension and presentation of the truth than any one individual or group of individuals can achieve is desirable, is in-

deed the very *raison d'etre* both of our individualism and of our fellowships, but that one thing only is essential, and that is that we should hold a fundamentally unitary faith in and about our Lord Jesus Christ as He is set forth in the New Testament. There is room for the full freedom of the Spirit and the New Testament itself declares that "the letter killeth," but the picture of Christ in the New Testament is not letter, but life. St. Paul knew no fundamental issue but the issue of Christ. He is the one and only foundation, the sufficient and indispensable condition. "Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ." And the possession of Christian spirit is the essential and sufficient credential. "If any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of his." If we are really at one in the acceptance of this New Testament conception and valuation of Christ, we have an adequate intellectual basis for our co-operative missionary undertakings and associations. Different forms of these undertakings, like literature societies and theological schools, will still involve special problems. Shall they present all types of Biblical criticism? Shall they describe and defend diverse theological points of view? One may hold earnestly his own convictions on these issues which exist among us, and may desire to see his convictions prevail, and yet as long as other men hold with him the New Testament view of Christ, he ought to be willing to allow, within the associations which he supports, the presentation of convictions which in all probability are as defective as his own are likely to be, in the patient hope of some larger and richer comprehension of the truth.

No doubt there are those who will demand more than this and others who would require less as the essential

basis of our continued co-operative relationships. But I can find no more or no less than is suggested here to have been laid down as requisite in the New Testament nor as warranted in the teaching of the Spirit in the corporate experience of the Church.

3. There remains the third question as to the limits of tolerance. Doubtless the ability of the missionary enterprise to find a common basis of co-operation has been rendered easier, among other reasons, by the school of toleration in which foreign missionaries have been forcibly trained by the nature of their undertaking. They could find no foothold for their existence unless they were tolerated by the non-Christian religions. They could not ask for this tolerance on any grounds except those on which they were prepared to concede it. They could not ask the non-Christian religions to tolerate Christianity on the ground that they were false and it was true. This was, in some sense at least, the issue to be decided between them. They must live together in peace and friendship until by love and persuasion the followers of the non-Christian faiths could be won to the acceptance of Christ. If such tolerance was the right principle on the part of Christianity toward the non-Christian religions, surely a spirit of love and tolerance similar in principle should prevail within the Christian fellowship among people who call themselves Christians.

Observe the question here is not a question of agencies of co-operation. We have already considered that. The present question is the question of tolerance It cannot be denied that both St. Paul (on moral grounds, Eph. v, 11; on grounds of belief, Rom. xvi, 17; on both grounds, II Cor. vi, 14-17; II Thess. iii, 6, 14, 15; I Tim. vi, 3-5) and St. John (II John 9, 10) sanctioned

the principle of the withdrawal of Christian fellowship even to the extent of social separation. It is equally clear, however, that both they and St. James and St. Peter preached a principle of inclusion far transcending our present Christian practice (Rom. xii, 18-21; xiv, 10-14; Gal. v, 14-15; vi, 1-3; Phil. i, 14-18; Col. iii, 11-14; II Thess. iii, 14-15; II Tim. ii, 24, 25; James ii, 2-4, 8, 10-12; I Peter iii, 8; v, 5; I John iii, 14; iv, 7, 12, 20; v, 2, 16; John iii, 5-8).

One wonders whether it would not be well for us to try to live yet more fully by these normal and regulative ideals of comprehension before we venture too far on the difficult path of judgment and excommunication where our human frailties have ever too free a play.

The end that we seek is the persuasion of all men to the truth, above all to the truth of the pre-eminence of Christ, in whom dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily. We may be sure that the path to this end is not the way of alienation and judgment and expulsion, but the way of gentleness and meekness and love, of the calm and reasonable statement of the grounds on which we hold what appears to us to be the truth. In this purpose we best help others and best pass on ourselves into the fuller apprehension, by keeping wide and kind the bounds of Christian fellowship, by preserving the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace, and by doing together as much of the service of the Kingdom of Christ as we can.

So much for the problem in the foreign mission field and the solution of it. Let us turn to the related but different issue of the attitude of Jesus. When did He ignore disagreements and when did He emphasize them and even go to the extent of denouncing the men and courses which met His disapproval?

This question is not raised in order to seek for guidance as to whom we may denounce and when we may denounce them. There are times when men may denounce men, and in days of over-tolerance and complaisancy we do well to ask ourselves whether we are as stern and faithful as the truth requires of us. We have not only our Lord's example, but the example of Paul, who had the love that suffered long and was kind, and that bore all things, but who, nevertheless, spoke forth in unfaltering denunciation of false and treacherous men. But Jesus' warning was ever against our judgment of our brother, and His challenge was ever to be sure that the beam was out of our own eyes before we sought to cast the mote out of the eye of our brother. Let us ask the question, accordingly, in order to scrutinize our own characters. What was it in men that Jesus so condemned that it led His gentle spirit to break forth in personal denunciation? That, whatever it was, is something against which we must be on guard.

There were many things which Jesus did not approve, and yet which did not call forth His denunciation of individuals or groups of persons in whom they were found. The Sermon on the Mount, positive as it was in its tone, is not a bit like the Ten Commandments in its prohibitions and condemnations. His own disciples displayed some of these forbidden qualities, and He said nothing to them personally, or if He spoke it was in firm but kindly remonstrance. Often He rebuked in the people whom He met the traits or principles which were alien to the spirit of the Kingdom of God, but neither His anger at unbelief, nor His disappointment at ingratitude, nor His disapproval of evil, issued in personal denunciation.

There were occasions, however, when He did denounce men. He denounced Herod most contemptuously (Luke xiii, 32). He pronounced a solemn word of denunciation on Chorazin and Bethsaida (Matt. vi, 20-24). He called the generation which rejected Him offspring of vipers, faithless, perverse, and adulterous (Matt. xii, 24, 39; xvii, 17). He called Simon, Satan, and told him he was a stumbling-block (Matt. xvi, 22, 23). He drove out the hucksters from the temple with a strong hand and stronger words, "robbers" and "thieves" (Matt. xxi, 12, 13). And repeatedly He denounced His arch enemies, the scribes and Pharisees (Matt. v, 20; xv, 1-20, 23). For what did He denounce these people?

Before answering this question, it is well to note that there were some things that did not save men from His denunciation. Prominence and power did not save a man. Herod was king. The Pharisees were the dominant party of the nation. He did not spare them because of their influence or station. And there must have been many honest and sincere men among the scribes and Pharisees, men who deemed the evidence that Jesus was the Messiah inadequate and unconvincing. But the most inveterate wrongs are those which are entrenched in conscience. Nothing is more terrible in ungodliness than its power to persuade itself that it is of God. The Pharisees were the best section of Israel, the most public-spirited, the most religious, the most conscientious, and all this did not deliver them from the most awful denunciations ever visited upon men. Nor did friendship save a man. Simon Peter was one of the closest companions of Jesus, and he was denounced as Satanic and ungodly.

Jesus seems never to have denounced any one for any

charge made against Himself. People said that He blasphemed in pronouncing sins forgiven (Mark ii, 7); then He cast out demons by Beelzebub, the prince of demons, with whom He was in league (Matt. xii, 24). His reply was, "Whosoever shall speak a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him" (Matt. xii, 32). He accepted quietly objections made to His course of action, or to that of His disciples (Mark ii, 23-28). He did not denounce the cowardice of secret discipleship (John vii, 50; xix, 38, 39), or the ignorance and spiritual dulness of His disciples (John xiv, 9), or the crime of His murderers, and the cruel injustice of His death (Luke xxiii, 34). He resented no affront. He sought to gain or keep or defend nothing for Himself.

What, then, did He denounce? In Herod, of whom He spoke witheringly as "that fox," He saw deliberate profligacy, vicious treachery, and paltering with truth. Herod was bad, but Jesus was not wont to denounce badness where there was any penitence or shame or sorrow in it; and even though the king was a man of debauched character, there were such men all around whom Jesus did not waste time in denouncing. What He saw in Herod was craft and deceit. Somewhere in this matter which the Pharisees brought to Him there was low cunning.

But it was something more than intrigue which led to Christ's denunciation. Others were engaged in that, of whom He said nothing. It was Herod's paltering with truth. He was glad to patronize a popular prophet, and to have Him about his court. Truth was a plaything, a fad. The man had no purpose to live it. He was a traitor to John, but above that he was a false man in the very sanctities of life. Truth was an intellectual interest, not a vital obligation. That attitude is always

the rotting out of the foundations. Jesus would not abide it.

But Jesus' great denunciations were of the scribes and Pharisees, and in speaking of them He repeatedly and explicitly declared what it was that He denounced in them.

In the foreground He set hypocrisy, which He abhorred (Matt. vi, 2, 5, 16). Again and again He broke forth, "Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites!" "Ye hypocrites" (Matt. xv, 7; xxii, 18; xxiii, 13, 15, 23, 26, 27, 29). Sometimes He spoke of the hypocrisy of the multitudes in courses which He pointed out (Luke xii, 56; xiii, 15), but for the most part He kept the term to describe what He condemned among the religious and political leaders of the nation. These men made false professions! They pretended to be what they were not. They required of others what they did not fulfil themselves. They erected ideals which they did not attempt to realize. Jesus put the moral obliquity of the lawyers unflinchingly: "Ye load men with burdens grievous to be borne, and ye yourselves touch not the burdens with one of your fingers" (Luke xi, 46). To preach what we make no real attempt to practice is to be guilty ourselves of the very fault which called forth Jesus' cry, "Ye hypocrites." This is the peril of religious teachers, of all leaders of men, in all ages. It is the greater peril because it is so often unaware of itself. The emotional sincerity of the preacher drives him into thinking that he is morally sincere. His feeling of the beauty of the ideal and the zeal of his proclamation pass as equivalent with him to the patient and severe obedience of it. Woe to such men in all days, our own as well as Christ's! Woe to us if we are such men! Woe, double woe, to us if in our zeal in saying this we blind our-

selves to the fact that we are blind to our blindness! And woe, also, to the far more common hypocrisy of our day which does not profess what it is, which has a faith or a longing for a faith which it conceals or denies! Does not hypocrisy consist as much in not professing what we are as in professing what we are not?

Our Lord dissected the hypocrisy which He denounced with subtlest skill, but perhaps the following were its chief elements:

1. Spiritual pride and self-satisfaction and exclusiveness, the idea of the scribes and Pharisees that they were superior men, and their erection of spiritual duty into a privilege and a caste. As in our day, they sought prominence. Now, as then, there are chief seats, presidencies, and moderatorships and speakers' tables. What Christ thought about those who seek them is plain (Luke xiv, 7-11). And there are spiritual self-approbations and jealous comparisons with others, and the erection of distinction where God sees none. The discriminations of clothes and situation and performance, then as now, were contemptible in His sight (Luke xviii, 9-14).

2. Spiritual blindness and inhospitality to new truth. This was their great fault! "Ye fools and blind," Christ called them (Matt. xxiii, 17, 19, 24, 26). They said they saw, and they saw not, and would not let others see. Many of them were thoroughly conscientious, doubtless, but conscience is not, and never was, a sure guide; and they were conscientiously unconscious of the very things that were most central and vital. The light in them on which they prided themselves was darkness. That was the hopeless feature of the situation (Luke xi, 35). There is a terrible warning to us in this, and in the repetition of the Pharisee's blunder,

in every age. We refuse truth that is offered to us. We do it conscientiously. We cannot see that it is truth. The Pharisees had just as much reason, to their minds, for rejecting the truth of Christ, as we find for rejecting truth offered to us. Our Lord's condemnation of their spiritual self-sufficiency and inhospitality to truth should put us on our guard and keep us on our guard, and make us very sensitive and open to whatever comes to us as truth. It may be error, but woe to us if we lock the doors to it and give it no heed, and wake on the morrow to discover that it was the Truth that we shut out and sought to slay.

3. Unbrotherliness and unforgiveness. They devoured widows' houses. They destroyed filial duty (Mark vii, 11). They were intolerable bigots (Matt. xxiii, 13-19). Jesus' heart was a heart of tenderest pity and forgiving love. He was ever displeased at any harshness towards the weak and innocent (Mark x, 13-16). God seeks the same kind of hearts in all His sons (Matt. vi, 15; xviii, 35; Luke ix, 55; xvii, 3, 4).

4. Anything that shut God off from man, that clouded the simplicity of His love, that took the emphasis from inward spiritual realities and placed it upon things eternal or upon forms. The Pharisees really kept men from God. They were gatekeepers who shut the door of the kingdom of heaven against men (Matt. xxiii, 13-28; Mark vii, 1-23). For the same reason Jesus cast out the men who turned His Father's house from a place of prayer into a place of merchandise and a den of thieves (John ii, 14-17; Mark xi, 15-17). And are we free from these perils today? Do we never misrepresent God and His kingdom? Do we never shut the kingdom of heaven

against men with our "conscientious convictions" about forms and times?

5. Of course, they had no faith. And Jesus did not deem want of faith a venial thing, a mere intellectual deficiency. Want of faith was to Him a moral disharmony, a want of vision of God, of will to trust and obey. Therefore He commanded it upon His disciples (Mark xi, 22). He marvelled at its absence (Mark vi, 6). He reproached men for the lack of it (Mark ix, 19). He even denounced the cities which refused to believe, and the generation that would not see and receive (Luke x, 8-16; xii, 56; John viii, 42-55).

This is no complete analysis of that shameful thing which Jesus denounced in Pharisees and scribes, but it will suffice to give each honest man food for much self-scrutiny and earnest meditation, lest he be found worthy of the condemnation and intolerance of the righteous Lord of men. The significant thing is that the emphasis of Jesus is on personal intellectual qualities more than upon anything else. The unthinking multitude of sinful men and women who listened to Him and confessed their sins, or who, hearing of Him, came humbly to Him for forgiveness, to these He spoke no bitter words of their evil which He did not condone. But He was sharp and thunderous against the thinkers who thought falsely, the sophistical moralists, the false teachers. Men say now that it is conduct which is the essential thing, not opinion. But Jesus said it was right opinion, issuing from a right mind or a right heart, which was the one vital thing. A commanding grasp of right principles, to alter slightly a word of Mr. John Morley's, is at the very root of coherency and uprightness of character. Our Lord's denunciation was not so much for actions or deeds as for false intel-

lectual and spiritual attitudes and wrong ethical principles. He did not denounce the publicans and the harlots, not because He did not care for moral behaviour, but because He knew that moral behaviour was simply a fruit, and that the essential thing was right life in the soul. That right life was spiritual integrity, involving right thoughts about God and duty, and right principles of action. He sought to make men whole again in God, to give them the life of God in His Son. The rest would follow. What He denounced was the stubborn and wilful opposition, the blind and self-confident pride, however conscientious and earnest, which, having eyes, saw not, and having ears, heard not.

Do we in any regard deserve in this day the denunciation and refusal of toleration which we think was so richly deserved in that day by those on whom it fell from the lips of the loving, long-suffering Saviour?

X

THE LEGITIMACY OF PRAYER

ONE of our living issues today, made more acute by our modern theories of nature, is the legitimacy of prayer. To Christians, it is reassuring to notice how universal is this instinct of prayer. It used to be one test of truth that that which was everywhere and by all men and in all times accepted as truth might be regarded as such. Now, if that test applies to any single fact of the Christian experience, it is to this matter of prayer. If it applies to any fact of human experience, it is to the reality of prayer; for while all men do not agree in believing in one personal God, it is practically true that almost all men, whether polytheists, or idolaters, or monotheists, believe in the reality and the efficacy of prayer. Even if, apparently, men have succeeded in eradicating this instinct, it almost inevitably reasserts itself when they come face to face with the deeper realities of life. It does so in the hours of great personal need. Mr. Moody used to tell how, on the steamship *Spree,* when the shaft was broken on their journey across the Atlantic, many men who had frankly disavowed any religious sympathy or faith found the instinct of prayer reawakened within them.

It happens inevitably and worthily in every time of great national need. It was Benjamin Franklin who proposed that the Continental Congress should open its sessions with prayer; and it was the old agnostic, Li Hung Chang, who, when the Yellow River overflowed

its banks and threatened the lives of many, when he was governor of the province of Chih-li, went with all his retinue to the temple reverently to pray to his gods.

Now, many of us would deny that we ourselves are moved much by this instinct of prayer who nevertheless have the instinct in us so deep that we could not root it out if we tried. It is a reassuring thing to a man when sceptical doubts arise as to the efficacy of prayer, to remember this universality of the prayer-impulse and to reflect that it is an almost inconceivable thing that all the race of men should be subject to a great and enduring instinct that, after all, is a mere delusion.

And yet it is not on the ground of this universal instinct that prayer is right, that we pray. It is because we are Christian men, and we rest our conviction of the reasonableness and usefulness of prayer on the example and the encouragement of our Lord Himself. If ever there lived one who did not need to pray and from whose life prayer might have been missed without consciousness of any imperfectness there, that man was Jesus Christ; and yet not only did He pray, but prayer stands out as the most dominant fact in His life. And if there ever lived a man whose testimony as to the reasonableness and the value of prayer was of worth, that man was Jesus Christ. And as we turn back and look at His life, more outstanding than any other fact is the great fact of His praying.

We see how, even in His case, it was prayer that kept His vision of moral duty clear. It was prayer that nerved Him to obey the will of God. It was prayer that illumined and beautified and transfigured His life. These things come out from the simplest inductive study of the inner life of our Lord. And we have preserved for us one great and notable prayer of His in which all the charac-

teristics of His prayer-life seem to be concentrated. We see there, in what may be most truly described as our Lord's prayer (John xvii), the simplicity, the reverence, the unselfishness, and the intense reality of His prayers.

And in all this our Lord did not live to His own mind an exceptional life. He was conscious in His prayer-life of simply working out that which ought to be in the life of every man, and by many devices and plans and forms of teaching He encouraged His disciples to believe that they might enjoy just such a life of prayer as they perceived in Him. In the plainest speech He stated it to them: "Ask, and ye shall receive; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you." And on the last night of His life He put it still more unequivocally, if possible. Perhaps we may reverently repeat His thought: "Hitherto you have not known what it was to pray, but now I am going away, and you can pray henceforth in my name, and whatsoever ye ask the Father in my name, he will give it to you. Ask, that ye may receive, and that your joy may be full. I do not say any longer to you that I will pray to the Father for you, for the Father himself loveth you, and ye can ask whatsoever ye will."

And not only did He encourage them in this general way to enter such a life of intercourse with His Father as that which they had witnessed in Him; by parable, with its irresistible implication, by direct doctrine, by His own example, He encouraged them to pray for things, and He encouraged them to pray for other men than themselves. Just to the extent that we find any moral authority in our Lord at all we find there satisfying sanction in support of that instinct of prayer within us that we cannot repress.

And yet it is at this point that our difficulties emerge.

We realize that we have this instinct of prayer; we do not deny that Jesus Christ prayed and that He bade men imitate Him and to believe that prayer was a real thing; but we have intellectual difficulties born of the temper of our day that make it impossible for many of us to respond to this instinct or to follow our Lord's example or authority in this matter.

Before we think of these difficulties let us raise one preliminary question. Are we quite sure that it is an intellectual difficulty that keeps us from making an adequate experiment in the matter of prayer? There are many men who attribute to intellectual difficulties obstacles in the way of their spiritual life which have a quite different location, and a man surely has no right to raise, as a difficulty in the way of His accepting Jesus Christ, intellectual scruples whose removal, if it were effected, would not result in his acceptance of Christ. The man who is staying away from Christ because the kind of life that he wishes to live makes it impossible for him to follow Christ has no right to allege as the reason for his not being Christ's disciple an intellectual difficulty. And in this matter of prayer a great many men think that they have intellectual difficulties whose real difficulties are moral. They are not willing to meet the ethical tests of the prayer-life. The prayer-life, if it once began with them, would cut away what they are unwilling to let go. Or they simply are not interested in religious conceptions or in the idea of prayer. And if we have difficulties like these in the way of our entering upon the life of prayer, let us deal with them first before we set up any intellectual scruples.

But let us suppose that our difficulties are not moral difficulties of the will, and that we would be glad to pray if only we could bring our reason to conceive of it as a

legitimate thing for an honest man to do. Our difficulty still grows out of the conception of the universe which colours and dominates all our thinking. We cannot help but conceive of this universe as an ordered whole, governed by laws exceptionless and regular, and not to be thrown into confusion by the whims and caprices of men; and we do not see how any such thing as prayer, conceived in a real way, can find a place in an ordered universe like this. Now, there was perhaps no man during the last century who felt this conception of the universe more deeply than Mr. Huxley, and yet he saw no difficulty in the way of believing in prayer, given a faith in the personality of God. In one of his letters to Charles Kingsley he says: "Not that I mean for a moment to say that prayer is illogical, for if the whole universe is ruled by fixed laws, it is just as logically absurd for me to ask you to answer this letter as to ask the Almighty to alter the weather." To be sure. If it is foreordained what the weather is going to be, it is foreordained also whether Mr. Kingsley is going to answer his letters.

As Huxley added, the whole question was the question of freedom and necessity over again. If there is no freedom in God or man, prayer goes, and almost everything goes with it. If we still believe in freedom, I suppose some of us will say that so far as human freedom is concerned, God has foreseen how men are going to use their freedom, and He has prearranged things to take care of the decisions that men make. But does that affect our conscious freedom of action? If God's prevision and prearrangement do not deprive me of my freedom of will, God's prevision and prearrangement do not deprive prayer of its efficacy and reality.

Or men say that so far as prayer is concerned it is an

effort to change the will of God, while in the exercise of my freedom I do not affect the will of God, but only the actions of my fellow men. This is not true. We affect God's will by the exercise of our free choice in precisely the same way in which we believe that we affect it in the exercise of the force of prayer.

And, after all, our difficulty in this whole matter arises because of our inadequate and superficial view of what the universe is: for prayer was meant to be a force in this universe just as really as our freedom was meant to be a force in it, and it is not the men who pray who disrupt the universe; it is the men who do not pray. That is the great principle that is embodied in one of the best chapters of Austin Phelps' " The Still Hour," one of the most notable books we have on prayer. His argument is that God lodged prayer as a force in the universe when He built it, and that He intended men to use prayer as a force in their lives, and that just as sin and not righteousness is the disruptive thing, so it is not prayer but prayerlessness which breaks in on the moral order of the universe. And if men object that prayer is a force incalculable in advance and so incapable of being worked into an ordered universe, we can only reply that personality and human freedom and sin are forces just as incalculable in advance as prayer is; and if God has succeeded in building an ordered universe in which men are free, in which men can sin if they will, in which our personalities are unhampered, He could also have built, as He did build, a universe in which it is possible for men to pray with prayer as a real effective power.

And the idea that our lives are small and that God is great, and would not bother with us, does not in the least break the force of the reasoning through which we have just come, for, after all, no man knows what is

small and what is great. We thought that some spectacular happening was the great event, and we see now that it was insignificant; we can recall a word, a tone, an influence, an averted gaze, which we see now to have been the great and determining experience.

And it is just so with our moral judgments. We do not know what is small. The thing that we are calling small may be the very event which by God's use is going to be the great and determining influence in our lives and in many other lives. We have no right to say with reference to anything that it is too small to consult God about or to have made a part of His direct activity. As Ruskin says in "Seven Lamps of Architecture," "We treat God with irreverence by banishing Him from our thoughts, not by referring to His will on slight occasions. He is not the finite authority or intelligence which cannot be troubled with small things. There is nothing so small but that we may honour God by asking His guidance of it or insult Him by taking it into our own hands."

And we may be perfectly sure about these lives of ours, which to us are not small but great concerns, that if ever there is any legitimacy in calling on the presence and power of God in His universe at all, or keeping them here, it is legitimate to ask and expect them in our personal lives.

Now, if what has been said has done enough to shake even a little our commonplace conceptions regarding the difficulties in the way of rational prayer, let us go on to the other question. A man will say: "Suppose I accept the theoretical validity of prayer, can I be sure that it is an actual and real thing, that there is any objective power to it, that it will accomplish results? Do men know that it has done so?" Well, we can appeal to our

own experience so far as the matter of the subjective influence of prayer is concerned, the reflex influence upon our own lives that comes from the use of this great and living force of prayer. And we turn back to the life of our Lord. There is no denying the help that He got from prayer. We read of His going into the Garden of Gethsemane, thinking that He was going to die there. The burden of the world's sin was so crushing His heart that He did not believe He could carry the burden through, and what He asked was that the cup of His imminent death there in the garden might pass away from Him; and the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews tells us what was the result: " In the days of his flesh, with strong crying and tears, he prayed unto him that was able to save him from death, and was heard in that he feared." There, in the Garden of Gethsemane, our Lord, weak, breaking, fearing that His end was come, threw Himself on the great and infinite power of God, and He found pouring down into His frail and breaking life the tides of strength that He needed to carry Him over and make Him the most tranquil spectator of His condemnation and the quietest heart present at His own crucifixion. And there is many a man who has had in his own measure just some such great experience as this. We have gone down weak, knowing that we were about to break and fail, and we flung ourselves on the great power of God, and in that hour God did not prove false to us. We drank of the cup of the fulness of His strength.

Trench puts this experience in one of his sonnets:

"Lord, what a change within us one short hour
Spent in Thy presence will prevail to make!
What heavy burdens from our bosoms take,
What parched grounds refresh as with a shower,

We kneel and all around us seems to lower,
We rise and all the distant and the near
Stands forth in sunny outline brave and clear.
We kneel how weak, we rise how full of power!
Why therefore do we do ourselves this wrong,
Or others—that we are not always strong,
That we are ever overborne with care,
That we should ever weak and heartless be,
Anxious or troubled, when with us is prayer,
And joy, and strength, and courage are with Thee?"

There is another difficulty that emerges here, and we may not pass it by. We say to ourselves, "How do I know that this has been in answer to my prayer? How do I know when this calm and tranquillity and strength come to me in my own heart and will in the hours of prayer, that it is anything more than the unsealing of the deeps of my own soul?" Well, what difficulty does that introduce? Is it any less supernatural because it seems perfectly natural? After all, God expresses Himself best to us when we ourselves are put by Him to our most perfect and divine development and use. God asks nothing more supernatural in this world than a perfect natural. That was and is His holy will. One argument for Christ's divinity is His flawless humanity. We believe that in his great book on "Nature and the Supernatural," to which we have already referred, Horace Bushnell's line of argument is unassailable, and that when he grounds a conviction of the divinity of our Lord on the impossibility of our classification of Him with men, on the perfectness of His humanity, it is the most unanswerable, but one, of the arguments that could be addressed to our hearts. There is no reason to distrust the divine response and action because it seems so natural and normal. That is God's preferable mode,

—none the less direct and supernatural. So Hallam writes to Tennyson: "With respect to prayer, you ask how I am to distinguish the operations of God in me from motions in my own heart. Why should you distinguish them, or how do you know there is any distinction? Is God less God because He acts by general laws when He deals with the common elements of nature?"

And as for the reality of prayer in its accomplishment of results outside of ourselves, we can appeal alike to our Lord's experience and our own in this. Our Lord accomplished positive objective results by prayer, and the whole New Testament is full of the conviction that prayer is a real power in achieving results outside of ourselves in the world. We recall the passage in the Epistle of James: "The prayer of a righteous man availeth much in its working. Elijah was a man with like passions with us, and he prayed fervently that it might not rain, and it rained not on the earth for three years and six months. And he prayed again, and the heavens gave rain and the earth brought forth her fruit."

Now, we may say that this is only an Old Testament fable, but the reality of that power is not confined to Old Testament "traditions." The reality of that power is a living thing in the lives of men today. There are many men like Stonewall Jackson and Chinese Gordon, men of the same type of character with ourselves, men dealing with actual things and temptations and problems just as we deal with them, and Stonewall Jackson and Chinese Gordon believed that they accomplished things by prayer. "Jackson's religion," says his biographer, Colonel Henderson, "entered into every action of his life. No duty, however trivial, was begun without asking a blessing, or ended without returning thanks. 'He had long cultivated,' he said, 'the habit

of connecting the most trivial and customary acts of life with a silent prayer.' " " We must believe," said Gordon, " that God, who has so encouraged us to pray, and who says, ' Ask, and ye shall receive,' is true to His word, and that therefore the prayer of man *is* answered." And consider men like James Gilmour and David Livingstone. " My creed," says Gilmour, " leads me to think that prayer is efficacious." At one period he lists five critical difficulties overcome in prayer. If we have any doubt as to the reality of prayer as an objective working force, turn to the last journals of David Livingstone. It was his habit on every birthday of the later years of his life to write down a prayer. On next to the last birthday of all occurs that great prayer: " My Jesus, my King, my Life, my All, I again dedicate my whole self to Thee. Accept me and grant, O gracious Father, that ere this year is gone I may finish my task. In Jesus' name I ask it. Amen. So let it be." It was not this year, but the next, in which the task was finished. And on the next and last birthday he wrote: " So many obstacles have arisen. Let not Satan prevail over me, O my good Lord Jesus." A few days after, March 24, 1873, he wrote: " Nothing earthly will make me give up my work in despair. I encourage myself in the Lord my God, and go forward." Just a month later his faithful men, as they looked into the hut at Ilala, while the rain dripped from the eaves, saw their master on his knees beside his bed, dead in the attitude of prayer.

We are not confronting a theory; we are not dealing with an imagination of pious men carried away by their devotion to the unseen. We are dealing with a great force that men have tried for hundreds of years, which those who have tried know to be as real as their own

personal freedom of choice, as real as the forces of nature or the force of their own personalities.

And now, if our difficulties have been so far met at least as to make us hospitable to a few simple suggestions, let us turn to them.

1. In the first place, if there is any one who, being discontented with his life of prayer, wishes to begin a new chapter in it, let him first of all conceive of prayer in a far more simple and real way than he has done. Some always tremble when they hear a prayer begun with an explanation to God of His own character. Our Lord knew infinitely more about God than any one knows now, and He never undertook to make a list at the beginning of His prayers, as an adjuration or for the information of God, of the various attributes of His character. Only once in all the prayer-life of our Lord do we find Him addressing God in any other way than " Father," or " My Father," and that is in His exclamation from the Cross, a quotation from the twenty-second Psalm, " My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me? " Every other time it was, very reverently but very simply, just " Father," or " My Father," or " Holy Father " once, or " Righteous Father " once.

I have a friend who is a medical missionary in Persia. Just before they broke up their American home, they were sitting down at the table, and the father was about to bow his head to say grace, when he saw that his little two-year-old boy had put his head down, and before ever this father could say a word he heard the little fellow say, in his imperfect English, with his head reverently bowed, " Shanks, Shodder." That was his way of returning thanks to God for what he knew God had provided for him. It was the very simple utterance of a child's heart. Would to God that some of us were not

such fools as to think that we know more, but were willing to be as childlike in our attitude toward God as we want our little children to be in their attitude toward us. Prayer, as Dean Bosworth used to point out, is one of the most awful and venturesome experiences of the Christian life, but it is also one of the simplest and most natural and most tender.

2. In the second place, let us be honestly ready to meet the moral tests that the life of prayer involves. There are some of us who are praying fervently about many things, and we have great clogs chained to us. God cannot give us spiritual deliverance with a moral clog tied fast around our ankles that we are carrying still. If we are going up into a new life of prayer a great moral purging may have to take place. We have to be willing to do the duties that prayer will reveal to us. We have to be ready to cut out those things that prayer will show us are not tolerable in the life of the man who is going to walk in fellowship with Christ. If we wish to come into a real and living fellowship with Christ, we have to be willing to pay the price for it.

3. And, in the third place, we have to conceive of this new habit and way as a life of prayer. It is not the performance of a few acts or the repetition of a few phrases. We speak properly of our Lord's experience in the matter of prayer as His life of prayer, and if we are to be men of prayer, as He was a man of prayer, we must make this business of prayer our life. Perhaps we cannot pray in solitude for two, and three, and four, and five, and six hours, as Andrew Bonar used to do. But a man can live a life of prayer without any such separation of himself in time as that. James Gilmour had the habit of never using a blotter. He simply made it a rule when he got to the bottom of any page to wait

until the ink had dried, and to spend that time in prayer. Try that device, or some other, and see what a test it is. You will be astonished how many pages there are to dry in the course of a month or two. Some such simple device helps to drive the reality of prayer into the core of life.

When we come to face the simple privilege and duty of a genuine life of prayer, how we have been dawdling and trifling and playing with the thing! No wonder it has not been a reality to us. We have not handled it as though it were a reality. We have not given to it one one-thousandth of the opportunity that we have given to unholy imagination. Suppose we resolved that we would choke every evil impulse with a turning by deliberate will of our minds and hearts to Christ in prayer, lo, as Trench said, "What a change within us!"

4. And, last of all, there is a line in the fine old hymn of Croly's that expresses an essential lesson of the school of prayer:

"Teach me the patience of unanswered prayer."

Have we not longed for the things that have not come to us? And if we would learn all that waits for us in this prayer-life we must learn this great secret. We remember the great experience in the life of St. Paul, in which three times he prayed for something and failed to get it, and was at last told by God that he should never have it. What came to him in consequence of his ungranted prayer? He says: "I besought the Lord thrice that it might depart from me, and he hath said unto me, My grace is sufficient for thee; for my power is made perfect in weakness. Most gladly, therefore, will I rather glory in my weakness that the power of Christ may spread a tabernacle over me." There is, I

think, only one other place in the New Testament where that expression occurs. It is the passage in the seventh chapter of the Revelation. " Therefore," says St. John of some, " therefore are they before the throne of God, and they serve him day and night in his temple; and he that sitteth on his throne shall spread his tabernacle over them. They shall hunger no more, neither thirst any more, neither shall the sun light upon them, nor any heat; for the Lamb that is in the midst of the throne shall be their shepherd and shall guide them unto fountains of waters of life, and God shall wipe away every tear from their eyes." Into some such life, quiet from the evil storms that beat upon us, tranquil in the perfect peace of God, led by the hand of Jesus Christ, may we all pass who are willing to take for ourselves all that Christ is encouraging us to take when He says: "After this manner, therefore, pray ye: ' Father.' "

XI

THE CHRISTIAN VIEW OF MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE

CHRIST taught a new and clear and revolutionary ideal of marriage and the family life, at variance with the ideas of His day and at variance with the ideas of ours. The New Testament conception of marriage is that it is an organic and indissoluble union of one husband and one wife. There is no evidence of the existence of polygamy in the New Testament Church. There are scores of passages which embody the unquestioning assumption of monogamy, and the only verses which some have deemed capable of a different construction are I Tim. iii, 2, 12, and Titus i, 6. But if these verses imply the existence and toleration of polygamy, then I Tim. v, 9 implies the existence and toleration of polyandry. No; marriage, as conceived in the New Testament, is of one man to one woman. And it is conceived as a permanent life relation. This is Christ's teaching, Matt. xix, 4-6: "And he answered and said, Have ye not read, that he who made them from the beginning made them male and female, and said, For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife, and the two shall become one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder." This view is what I Tim. iii, 2, and Titus i, 6 prove that Paul taught in the case of the husband, and Rom. vii, 2 and I Cor. vii, 39 unequivocally assert it in the case of the

wife, while I Cor. vii, 2-4 asserts it for both. Husband and wife are bound together in the deepest unity. Paul speaks of them as forming only one body, not physically only (as Jesus says), but in the deepest mystical sense, as loving one another with a complete and unselfish love, "even as Christ also loved the Church." "Even so ought husbands also to love their own wives as their own bodies. He that loveth his own wife loveth himself; for no man ever hated his own flesh; but nourisheth and cherisheth it, even as Christ also the church; because we are members of his body. For this cause shall a man leave his father and his mother and shall cleave to his wife; and the two shall become one flesh. This mystery is great; but I speak in regard of Christ and of the church. Nevertheless, do ye also severally love each one his own wife even as himself" (Eph. v, 28-33). There are many expressions of this lofty Christian ideal of marriage in the New Testament: Col. iii, 18, 19; Titus ii, 4, 5; I Peter iii, 1-7; Eph. v, 23. And the use of the marriage ideal in the passage in Ephesians, to express the relationship of Christ to His Church, raises marriage to the level of the highest and holiest thought possible to man. (See also Rev. xix, 7, 9; xxi, 9.)

1. Can the marriage relationship be dissolved except by death? There are those who hold that not even death dissolves it, and who find a confirmation of their view in our Lord's words in Matt. xxii, 30, and in Paul's use of marriage as the symbol of Christ's union with His Church. But the teaching of Rom. vii, 2, 3, and I Cor. vii, 39 is explicit that on the death of the husband, and only then, the wife is free to remarry, and presumably the same reasoning holds in the case of the death of the wife.

2. But can anything else than death dissolve the marriage? There are three different passages in which our Lord's views as to marriage and divorce are set forth: Matt. v, 31, 32; Luke xvi, 18 and Mark x, 2-12 (and its parallel passage in Matt. xix, 3-12). The teaching in Luke xvi, 18 and Mark x, 2-12 is clear and unequivocal, and would forbid divorce, without any exception whatever, but for the qualification of this view by Matthew's account: "Everyone that putteth away his wife, and marrieth another, committeth adultery; and he that marrieth one that is put away from a husband committeth adultery" (Luke xvi, 18). "And there came unto him Pharisees, and asked him, Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife? trying him. And he answered and said unto them, What did Moses command you? And they said, Moses suffered to write a bill of divorcement, and to put her away. But Jesus said unto them, For your hardness of heart he wrote you this commandment. But from the beginning of creation male and female made he them. For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife; and the two shall become one flesh; so that they are no more two, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder. And in the house the disciples asked him again of this matter. And he saith unto them, Whosoever shall put away his wife, and marry another, committeth adultery against her; and if she herself shall put away her husband, and marry another, she committeth adultery" (Mark x, 2-12).

3. This clear teaching, allowing for no divorce whatever, is modified in Matt. v, 31, 32, and in Matthew's version (xix, 3-12) of the teaching recorded without exception or qualification in Mark x. "It was said

also, Whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a letter of divorcement; but I say unto you, that every one that putteth away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, maketh her an adulteress: and whosoever shall marry her when she is put away committeth adultery" (Matt. v, 31, 32). "And there came unto him Pharisees, trying him, and saying, Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause? And he answered and said, Have ye not read, that he who made them from the beginning made them male and female, and said, For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife; and the two shall become one flesh? So that there are no more two, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder. They say unto him, Why then did Moses command to give a bill of divorcement, and to put her away? He saith unto them, Moses, for your hardness of heart, suffered you to put away your wives: but from the beginning it hath not been so. And I say unto you, Whosoever shall put away his wife, except for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery: and he that marrieth her when she is put away committeth adultery. The disciples say unto him, If the case of the man is so with his wife, it is not expedient to marry. But he said unto them, Not all men can receive this saying, but they to whom it is given. For there are eunuchs, that were so born from their mother's womb; and there are eunuchs, that were made eunuchs by men; and there are eunuchs, that made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake. He that is able to receive it, let him receive it" (Matt. xix, 3-12).

The teaching of Mark x, unmodified by Matthew's account, is unmistakable. It forbids all divorce, and

if either husband or wife puts away the other and remarries, he or she commits adultery. In Matthew, however, divorce is clearly recognized.

The passages in Matthew, however, are not without difficulty. First of all there are textual difficulties as to Matt. xix, 9. Some ancient authorities, as the American Revised Version margin indicates, omit the last clause of the verse and others give a different rendering for the words "committeth adultery," which they render, in conformity with Matt. v, 32, "maketh her an adulteress." The latter translation also presents difficulty of interpretation. Secondly, there are different constructions of the significance of "put away" and of "fornication" and "adultery."

Certainly the utmost that the passages in Matthew require or allow is the single modification of the teaching as given in Luke and Mark, namely, that the marriage relationship may be dissolved by unfaithfulness: as some hold, by unfaithfulness prior to marriage but only discovered afterwards (fornication), and others, by unfaithfulness after marriage (adultery). It would seem from all the passages that the latter is the only clearly recognized ground for divorce, but at the most, certainly, there is no cause recognized other than these two.

4. But it is held by some that Paul, in I Cor. vii, 10-17, allows divorce on other grounds than adultery. But is this the case? Paul's words are as follows: "But unto the married I give charge, yea not I, but the Lord, That the wife depart not from her husband (but should she depart, let her remain unmarried, or else be reconciled to her husband); and that the husband leave not his wife. But to the rest say I, not the Lord: if any brother have an unbelieving wife, and she is content to

dwell with him, let him not leave her. And the woman that hath an unbelieving husband, and he is content to dwell with her, let her not leave her husband. For the unbelieving husband is sanctified in the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified in the brother; else were your children unclean; but now are they holy. Yet if the unbelieving departeth, let him depart; the brother or the sister is not under bondage in such cases; but God hath called us in peace. For how knowest thou, O wife, whether thou shalt save thy husband; or how knowest thou, O husband, whether thou shalt save thy wife? Only as the Lord hath distributed to each man, as God hath called each, so let him walk. And so ordain I in all the churches."

What is Paul's teaching here, and how is it related to the teaching of our Lord?

a. In the case of a believing husband and wife, Paul makes no provision whatever for divorce, discountenances, with Christ's authority, any separation, and, if there is separation, forbids remarriage.

b. In the case of a marriage where one party is not a Christian, Paul (stating that he is not now quoting Christ as he had done in the preceding counsel) again makes no provision for divorce, disapproves separation, but allows the non-Christian partner to depart. He says nothing about remarriage, and it is clear that the original marriage has not been annulled by the departure of the unbeliever.

c. Our Lord's teaching makes no explicit distinction between or reference to the believing or unbelieving status of the parties. His words occur in the Sermon on the Mount, spoken to the disciples, but also to the multitudes, and are applicable in the same sense and to the same people to whom the rest of the Sermon on the

Mount is applicable, certainly to all Christians. Christ recognizes no separation at all, except divorce for the one cause of adultery, and He says nothing whatever about the remarriage of the innocent party, and would appear clearly to forbid the remarriage of the guilty party.

d. If these passages are combined it would appear to have been the New Testament teaching—

(1) That there can be no divorce except for adultery.

(2) That separation (not including divorce) is deprecated but recognized, although only in the case of the wife (but should she depart, let her remain unmarried, or else be reconciled to her husband; I Cor. vii, 11) or where one of the two partners is an unbeliever, and then only on the part of the unbeliever. This is all that Paul's words specifically cover with regard to the Corinthian Church. Moreover, he specifically disapproves the union, in the first place, of believers with unbelievers (II Cor. vi, 14, 15). There is not a word in the New Testament which justifies or approves the separation of believers, or their divorce on the ground of separation or desertion, or any other ground whatever, except adultery.

(3) That the Church may not remarry persons who have separated but who have not been divorced for adultery; such persons are still married according to the Christian law, and remarriage would be bigamy.

As to remarriage. As already indicated, Paul allows the remarriage of husband or wife after the other's death, Rom. vii, 23; I Cor. vii, 39 ("I desire therefore that the younger widows marry, bear children, rule the household, give no occasion to the adversary for reviling," I Tim. v, 14), but declares that any other remarriage is adulterous: "For the woman that hath a

husband is bound by law to the husband while he liveth; but if the husband die, she is discharged from the law of the husband. So then if, while the husband liveth, she be joined to another man, she shall be called an adulteress; but if the husband die, she is free from the law, so that she is no adulteress, though she be joined to another man" (Rom. vii, 2, 3).

Inasmuch as the New Testament, except in the Matthew passages, has no allowance for divorce, it of course gives no instruction regarding the remarriage of divorced persons. Are there any such instructions in the passages in Matthew? Yes; note Matt. v, 32 and Matt. xix, 9. "But I say unto you that every one that putteth away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, maketh her an adulteress: and whosoever shall marry her when she is put away committeth adultery." "And I say unto you, Whosoever shall put away his wife, except for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery: and he that marrieth her when she is put away committeth adultery." It is clear from these (1) that the man who divorces his wife, except for "fornication," and remarries is guilty of adultery; (2) that whoever marries a wife divorced for "fornication" commits adultery; (3) that a man who puts away his wife, except for "fornication," causes her to commit adultery (presumably if she remarries).

What shall we say, then, of the New Testament teaching as a whole regarding the remarriage of divorced persons and the attitude of the Church toward it?

a. Nothing is said in recognition or sanction of the remarriage of an innocent divorced person, and it may be claimed that the New Testament conception of marriage disallows such marriage. Or precisely the opposite position can be defended, namely, that adultery

dissolves the marriage for the innocent. In the absence of specific prohibition, and in view of the past practice of the Church, it might be argued that such remarriage of an innocent party should not be forbidden, and may be performed by Christian ministers.

b. That the Church may not remarry persons guilty of adultery. The New Testament teaching is plain that adulterers have no part in the kingdom of Christ or of God (I Cor. vi, 9, 10; Gal. v, 19, 21). This is not to say that this sin, as all sins, may not be forgiven and atoned for by our Saviour and Redeemer. But it is to say that all such persons have forfeited the right to remarry; their remarriage is contrary to our Lord's explicit word (Matt. v, 32; xix, 9).

c. As to the determination of innocence or guilt on the part of divorced persons seeking remarriage, it is to be remembered that the civil law gives the Church no right to grant divorce, but reserves such right to the State. Ministers, therefore, should accept and stand upon the legal record. If it does not show that divorce was granted for the one and only cause recognized and allowed by Christ, then the Church may not perform the remarriage of either party.

d. Such judgments as these with regard to the duty of the Church and its ministry do not undertake to invade the field of the policy and procedure of the State. Whether the State should pursue with regard to divorce and remarriage the same course as the Church, we do not discuss. We simply draw forth the clear teaching of the New Testament as embodied in the words of our Lord and St. Paul.

Is the New Testament teaching meant to be binding today? 1. Is the New Testament teaching on these subjects valid for us, or was it local and temporary?

There are, of course, New Testament teachings which the Church does regard as local and temporary, or as moral and spiritual rather than social and legislative, as for example, feet washing (John xiii, 14), the holy kiss (II Cor. xiii, 12), woman's dress and ornaments and hair arrangement (I Tim. ii, 9; I Cor. xi, 5, 13; I Peter iii, 3), wine drinking (I Tim. iii, 3, 8; v, 23), anointing with oil (Jas. v, 14), acquiesence in slavery (I Tim. vi, 1; I Cor. vii, 20-24, these verses being in immediate connection with Paul's teaching about marriage and divorce; I Peter ii, 13-19). And in the Sermon on the Mount, where the teaching of Matt. v, 31, 32 is found, there is much which the Church interprets in a spiritual and restricted sense (Matt. v, 22, 25, 34, 39, 42, etc.).

2. Indeed, we may go further and say that our Lord refused to be a legislator or to lay down social or economic or even moral regulations. He dealt in great spiritual principles which He left to all time and all peoples to apply to the necessary forms of their own age and life. This makes it all the more significant that in this one central, vital and fundamental matter of the marriage relationship on which the divine institution of the family rests Jesus should have spoken so definitely and absolutely as He did. " But from the beginning of the creation, male and female made he them. For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife; and the two shall become one flesh: so that there are no more two, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let no man put asunder " (Mark x, 6-9).

3. Here is no local and temporary teaching, or an adaptation to transitory social conditions, but a principle which our Lord declares goes back to the foundations of life and time, and roots itself in the mind and

law of God. If this teaching of our Lord is not final and authoritative, what word of His may be so regarded? He recognized that there were two social ideals in the matter, the Old Testament law of marriage and divorce and the conception of the Christian dispensation. There are two ideals in the world now, the varying irregular ideals of most of our American states and the ideal of Christ, which ought to be the ideal of the Church.

4. Shall it be the ideal of the Church, or will the Church go down to the lower level and take up a position further from the New Testament teaching than the laws of some few of our states which still adhere to this New Testament conception of marriage and divorce? At present the Presbyterian Church allows divorce for reasons not sanctioned in the New Testament, and indeed, in its legislation on the subject, it makes no mention of the Bible, but sets forth secular and contractual conceptions which are not found in the New Testament at all. Ought we not, in loyalty to our own exaltation of the authority of the Scriptures and, above all, of our Lord Himself, to rest our position on the plain teaching of the New Testament and in all the doctrine and work of the Church to cherish, maintain and commend the conception of marriage which alone is worthy of comparison with the union of Christ and His Church?

5. After writing this chapter, I received a letter from Prof. A. T. Robertson, of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, in answer to a letter in which I stated to him these conclusions and asked him whether his study of the New Testament had led him to a different position. Prof. Robertson is, I suppose, now our foremost American authority in New Testament Greek. He writes:

"I find myself wholly in agreement with your view that the New Testament allows divorce only for adultery, and remarriage only for the innocent party. Broadus, in his Commentary on Matthew, presents this view ably and clearly. Paul, as you say, allows separation, but not divorce on other grounds.

"I do not think that Jesus laid down laws so much as stated principles, but surely a Christian will want to follow the teaching of Jesus rather than a state law. I agree with you, also, that Jesus intended His view of marriage and divorce to be permanent."

1. It is objected that these requirements are too hard and burdensome for human nature, and that they must be relaxed for us today just as Moses relaxed the divine ideal. Where, then, shall we stop? If Christ's clear teaching is to be rejected at this point in the interest of human weakness or mistake, why may it not be rejected anywhere else? But it is said that to insist on this position will work hardship: "Adulterers have sincerely repented. May they not remarry when their penitence is indisputable? Or young people have been hurried, under parental or other pressure, into unwise marriages whose permanence would have wrought more harm and wrong than their dissolution. Is it not best to undo such an error and to allow a later happy marriage?" Undoubtedly difficult problems will arise. It can only be contended in reply that those who hold the civil and contract view of marriage, rather than the New Testament view, can avail themselves of the civil provisions for divorce and remarriage, but that the Church can only adhere unyieldingly to the New Testament conceptions both of marriage and divorce and remarriage; that the sufferings of an unhappy marriage, if unbearable, may be met by separation without divorce,

with continued support of the wife by the husband; and that the evil of the Church's refusal to remarry is less than the evil of the abandonment by the Church of the New Testament ideal. That ideal of the unity, purity and indestructibility of the marriage relationship is the greatest social need of the world today.

2. It is objected that to adopt these positions would separate the Church adopting them from other Christian bodies pursuing a more liberal course. On the other hand, it would range such a Church with a large body of kindred Churches, Methodist Episcopal (until its last Conference), Protestant Episcopal, United Lutheran, the Reformed Church in America and the Reformed Church in the United States, and with the Roman Catholic Church, which in these matters adheres, in theory, unyieldingly to the New Testament position.

3. It is objected that such views and practices, if adopted by any Church, will place a stigma on those members of the Church whose marriage relationships have been at variance with these positions, and will shut the door of the Church in the future to people married under civil laws which are not in accord with the laws of the Church. In some cases this may be true. This is the situation in all the Churches named in the preceding paragraph. What shall be done in such cases? Shall they be admitted to the fellowship and membership of the Church? No new answer is attempted here. All that is here proposed is that the language of the law of any Church as to marriage, divorce and remarriage should be conformed to the New Testament.

As to what the laws of the State should be with regard to marriage and divorce, as contrasted with the laws of the Church, it may be said that the principle of identity or difference between the two sets of laws is not

different from the same issue in other fields, such as trusteeship, the relation of employer and employee, attitude toward poverty, sumptuary laws, etc. And there are not wanting those who would even now bring the marriage and divorce laws of the State into closer accord with the Christian ideals set forth here.

In a recent radio address, abolition of divorce and the enactment of federal laws governing the matrimonial relationships were advocated by Supreme Court Justice Joseph Morschauser, of the State of New York, who has presided at many divorce trials. He denounced irreverence for marriage as a menace to the nation.

" There should be a national law governing divorce, making the laws of every State the same upon the question," he said. " It is because divorce strikes at the sanctity of the home, because it breaks up the home, that most sacred institution to children and hence to our civilization, that economists, preachers and all well-wishers of society look with great alarm upon the growing number of divorces in American life."

He went on to declare that we should have " a new understanding of the sacredness of the marriage relation, that it is the most binding of all contracts, a contract that concerns not only the individuals making it, the children which may be born as a result of it, but the State and the nation, and indeed, all mankind." A desire to end a marriage " if conditions are not exactly as they have been thought in advance to be," he characterized as " a grievous sin."

He urged that " every preacher and every teacher, every writer and every newspaper and magazine publisher; every one who in any sense has the ear of the public," should try to " get this conception of marriage into the minds of the American people." "And then,"

he went on, " I would have this reawakened understanding of the importance and sacredness of the marriage relation reflected upon the law books of the nation."

He deplored the divergence of the divorce laws of the various States, and continued: " I would abolish divorce entirely. I would grant annulments of improper marriages, such as are provided for by the present law of New York. In cases of misconduct on the part of either husband or wife, or in the case of incompatibility, or in case of any cause which rendered their living together undesirable or improper, I, of course, would not compel them to live together, and would grant separations. But in no cases would I grant absolute divorce."

He declared that preventing the innocent party from seeking " possible happiness in another union " was " one of the possible inequalities of the plan I propose," but that he favoured it nevertheless because " it is justified by results." " More people who now seek and secure divorces could compose their differences and live together to the end of their lives, with resultant benefit to their children and to society, if they knew the law would not grant them a divorce, but only a separation," he said.

As to whether such a law would increase immorality, he said, " I would punish criminally those guilty and not let them go unpunished as at present " (New York Times, March 11, 1929).

The State may allow a lower standard for its citizens, but in doing so it is descending from the standard of Christ. That does not justify Christians in descending. The Church may not exercise the laxity of the State without disloyalty and unfaithfulness.

XII

THE EQUALITY OF WOMEN IN THE CHURCH

SEVERAL years ago, in one of our largest and strongest denominations, a sub-committee of the permanent committee, or General Council, of the Church submitted a report on "Causes of Unrest Among Women of the Church." The report dealt with various minor causes in the organization and administrative work of the Church, but came clearly to the view that one fundamental cause of unrest was the failure of the Church to recognize and welcome the equal participation and responsibility of women in all the life and work of the Church.

The women, to be sure, are recognized as full members of the Church in most communions, but not in all. A questionnaire addressed to one hundred and eighteen denominations in the United States showed that in seventy-four of them the women had full and equal status in local congregations with the men as lay members, but that in thirty-four denominations they did not. In the highest denominational court in these denominations, such as the General Conference, the Council, the General Synod, or General Assembly, seventy-six denominations gave the women full and equal status and thirty-three did not. In the matter of the ministry, forty-three denominations ordained women and sixty-one did not.

In most Churches women are free and urged to take

their full share in giving and in the activities of the Church. Indeed, the major burden is often laid upon them, but they often do not enjoy an equitable voice in determining the use of their own gifts or the policies of the work which they are themselves doing. Investigation in one denomination indicated that sixty per cent or more of the attendance at church and of the church membership were women, that (if the churches selected for study were representative of the whole denomination, as there was no reason to suppose they were not) the women gave fifty-six and six-tenth per cent of the general benevolence budget of the Church and fifty-seven and six-tenth per cent of the church support, and in addition made their contributions through their own missionary boards and societies. In this denomination the women had equal voice and vote in local congregational meetings, but no representation in any of the higher courts of the Church, and they were ineligible to the eldership and the ministry, which, according to the constitution of the Church, had full jurisdiction over the life and work of the Church. There was in this particular denomination also a strong effort to limit the freedom of the women, even in the administration of their distinctive gifts to their own women's societies. A few paragraphs from the report on "Causes of Unrest," to which reference has been made and which, it may be said, related primarily to the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., will bring out the situation:

"Are the women unwilling to accept the control prescribed by Presbyterian law?

"*Yes* and *No*. A good many women were most sympathetic to the statements:

1. The women have no part in determining the policy or

defining the faith of the Presbyterian Church. This is contrary to the spirit of both justice and democracy.

2. The biological fact of sex excludes women from a seat in the General Assembly and the other courts of the Church. Intelligence and spirituality should be the determining qualities for a seat in these bodies.

"And many women who were not, and are not, ready to subscribe to statements they felt to be radical, nevertheless are of the opinion that the autocratic methods in vogue fail to secure real co-operation, and believe that much of the present confusion could have been avoided had men and women thought together on equal terms in the Church's planning.

"As women have advanced from 'Womanly Woman to Intelligent Being,' as Mr. Langdon-Davies says, they are having too many opportunities for service to be content to be relegated to the group which prepares suppers, cares for flowers, does deaconess work and deals with details. They are glad to share in the doing of these and other things which come naturally within the scope of their activities, but they desire to share likewise in the opportunities for larger service. One woman, nationally known, called to lead large undertakings outside of the Church, and a devoted member of the Presbyterian Church, wrote that 'the Presbyterian Church does little less than insult the intelligence of its womanhood; that when she was in the Congregational Church in a prayer-meeting she felt that she had to be using her mind to see if she could not make a contribution to the meeting, but that in the Presbyterian Church, all that was expected of her was just to sit. She was never expected to speak in any regular church service, even of the informal prayer-meeting type.' It is true that this is not today true of all Presbyterian churches, but it does represent much of Presbyterian habit.

"What harm has resulted and may result to the Church from the autocratic control by one sex?

"Men's methods and women's differ, but both types should be valuable and each support the work of the other.

Men generalize; women particularize. Such generalizations commonly accepted are not always true as they sound, but if they be true, both forms of service must be valuable. Men 'view with alarm.' Women 'want to do something about it.' Each should supplement the other. . . .

"The 'expanding opportunities for women in intellectual life, in political, in industrial life' must be met by 'dissolving concepts in men's minds,' says another. . . .

"In this study, the question was asked as to whether in the Church responsibility for work is carried by men alone, or by men and women working together. The answers from a very large group indicate that there is a separation on the basis of sex in more churches than there is unity of service. But there seems almost unanimous opinion that each group works best and most enthusiastically separate from the other; at the same time many of those who have thought most carefully, as evidenced by their answers, indicate that they feel this to be an unfortunate situation, and they hope for a day when men and women may work more unitedly.

"A desire to work unitedly is on the ground of justice and efficiency; those who believe it the better way feel that women cannot give their best service in the Church so long as they meet with denials of opportunity, and also that as the service of the Church is a unit it should be developed by both groups working together. It is, of course, natural that, having been separated for generations, the sexes should find co-operative work difficult, but that fact should not be a cause of separation continuously. . . .

"In reply to the question as to whether men would withdraw from service if women entered them, the answers show some agreement with the view—'If we should elect and seat one woman the men would soon see that the entire Council were composed of women.' 'Men rather resent presence of women.' 'Great majority of men object to work on an equality with women.'

"Closely related to this is the question as to whether men and women work better together or separately:—here there

is much difference of opinion by individuals, but more strikingly by denominations; in those denominations where women are accorded fuller opportunity for initiative there is a tendency to note that they work well together, in denominations where the status of women is low it is noted that they do not—the preponderance of answers indicating, 'Their advice on local church boards is good, but is not given an equal hearing with the men. They do not work well with men; are not willing to be bossed when men *do* so little.' 'Both work better alone. No initiative except alone.' 'Men cannot accept women as people.' 'No feeling of partnership in church's work.' One might say that opinions are fifty-fifty for working together or separately, but reasons why they cannot work together are almost unanimous. 'Men object to women on boards solely on point of efficiency.' 'Any attempt to change would risk grave results,' says one pessimistic brother. The interesting thing in the above is that all answers, whether from ministers, laymen or women, indicate a lack of confidence by men of women's ability and unwillingness to accord her free play for her abilities. 'Men feel women are not their equals intellectually.'

"Probably there was no topic on which there was a wider diversity of opinion than on that which asked, 'Do the place and work which the Church offers to women give them opportunities for their fullest development and service?' Three-quarters of the replies said, 'Yes,' one-fourth, 'No,' but the greater number modified this statement, and it was in these modifications that one must find an approach to the future situation. It is unquestionable that in all of the denominations many women have found in the service of the local church opportunity for all that they desire to do and for all that they are capable of doing, but it always must be borne in mind that the service to be done by the Church is delimited to certain forms of activity, and those can use but a limited number of women. In a church with three hundred women a certain number are needed as

Sunday School teachers, but comparatively few are prepared for this service. Organizations within the Church claim a certain number in active service, but even these leave a great body of women without an opportunity to express themselves in any large way. The question would therefore come, and rightly, as to whether it should be expected that all women in the Church should express themselves there. Whether the Church is not rather the place where inspiration shall be received and from which many shall go out to serve their communities through agencies better prepared than the Church to handle certain lines of philanthropic and civic work. In the nationally organized work of the Presbyterian Church it is unquestionable that certain women have opportunity equal to that offered by any organizations in the country to use their greatest ability and to utilize their own initiative. But it is interesting to note that of three hundred and forty-four answers made to the question, 'What special contributions have women to make to the life and work of the Church at this time,' only forty replies indicated any service that included organizational responsibility. The other answers indicated that she was 'to cultivate spirituality,' to 'encourage higher ideals,' 'stimulate optimism,' 'teach Sunday School,' 'care for missionary and educational work.' This, perhaps, would account for one reply which said 'the woman of originality has to make and find a place for herself in the Church while outside organizations eagerly seek her.' . . .

"Has this situation made the women bitter? Only in a few instances, we believe; they simply go elsewhere for opportunity. Would women exercise the privilege of serving in the Church Councils if this were accorded them, is often asked. This might be answered in the words of one woman who, when asked whether she felt that the extension of the suffrage to women had been a success, replied, 'The question has no interest for me. Obviously it admits no answer. In a democracy, government is the business of the entire adult population.' . . .

"A tragic commentary on the antagonism aroused among thinking women by the attitude of churchmen of many denominations might be found in the publication in 1895 of the Woman's Bible, in the introduction to which there is found the following: 'A few of the more democratic denominations accord women some privileges, but invidious discriminations of sex are found in all religious organizations, and the most bitter, outspoken critics of women are found among clergymen and bishops of the Protestant religion.' One would not praise so unfortunate and unhappy an effort as that of publishing any part of the Bible to prove that woman's condition 'today has been shaped by the ordinance and discipline of the Church founded on the Old and New Testaments,' but from even so unhappy and unfortunate a venture one may learn some lessons.

" But one may ask with justifiable bewilderment,—what are the specific things which women wish in the Church that they do not now have? It would be difficult and futile to attempt to define this. Few wish any specific opportunity. What they do wish is the removal of inhibitions which constantly remind them that they are not considered intellectually or spiritually equal to responsibilities within the Church. Most ask for no one thing, only, that artificial inhibitions that savour of another century having been removed, they may take their place wherever and however their abilities and the need of the Church may call. Woman asks to be considered in the light of her ability and not of her sex. She recognizes that being, as one woman said, 'the first generation out of the kitchen' she has much to learn, but she cannot be a 'new woman' in all phases of her life and willingly accept the position accorded her in the Church. Her mind rebels, even if her heart keeps her tongue quiet. A prominent Presbyterian woman wrote recently:

" 'I think the fundamental difficulty is that women have more freedom and initiative in the State than in the Church. The increasing unwillingness of the men, from local church to Assembly, to allow the women to decide or even to exert

influence about matters in which they are as vitally interested as the men, is being realized more and more by the women.' . . .

"What is it that women desire? What is it that will do away with unrest among the women of the Church? The women ask for no preferential treatment, but rather for the opportunity to serve unhampered wherever their zeal or knowledge may be of service. Remove artificial restraints and barriers, and it will be found whether men and women work better together or separately."

Now, with regard to the question of the equality of rights for women in the Church, or with regard to any other issue that may arise in the life and work of the Church, there is only one question that need ever concern us, namely, What is right? It does not matter what our personal prejudices or preferences may be. If a certain course of action is right, that is the end of it. There is always and only one thing for us to do, and that is to do right.

What is right in the matter of the place of women in the Church? Is it right or wrong that they should be given full liberty of service and full equality of status and opportunity? Is it right or wrong that there should be discrimination of sex in the life and work of the Church?

The Old Testament unquestionably recognized the validity of women's participation in the offices of the Jewish Church. Miriam was a prophetess. She and other women shared in the work of building and furnishing the tabernacle. Seven centuries later Micah names her as one of those by whom God had brought His people out of Egypt. Deborah was a judge of Israel on exactly the same basis with Gideon and Ehud.

The office of prophetess is recognized again and

again. Huldah the prophetess identified the sacred record (II Kings xxii, 14). Women as publishers of the word of the Lord are recognized and welcomed (Psa. lxviii, 11). Their equal rights are indicated, and not less their right to service. They took their share in rebuilding the walls of Jerusalem (Neh. iii, 12).

In a remarkable Bible study published forty years ago, entitled "May Women Speak?" Dr. George P. Hays sums up the Old Testament principle with which the Christian Church in the New Testament began, in these words: "Whatever may be true about women speaking now, it is absolutely certain it was not wrong down to the apostles' day. If, in the New Testament, woman is not allowed to do what the providence of God and the call of His people seem to indicate, then we have found one point in sharp distinction from all others, where the New Testament is narrower, more restricted and more in bondage than the Old Testament. The general theory has been that, with the coming in of the New Testament, old burdens were taken off, and liberality and enlargement granted to the Church. On this principle, its friends defend infant baptism. On this principle of enlargement, the Gospel is shown to be sent to the Gentiles. Whatever, therefore, may have been the actual frame of mind in which the New Testament converts from the Jewish Church entered upon their work, Scripture gives no reason to believe that they would for a moment think woman was not at liberty to speak whenever God bade her, and the people were willing to hear her."

Did the New Testament renounce or reject this principle? Assuredly not in the Gospels. The Gospel story begins with the ministry of women, Mary and Elizabeth and Anna, whom the evangelists specifically

call a prophetess (Luke ii, 36). Women went about with Jesus as His disciples and shared in His ministry. It is an old observation that they were last at His Cross and first at His tomb.

"Last at the cross we women were.
Let us reach first the sepulchre."

It was to a woman He appeared first after His Resurrection and made her the first messenger of the full Gospel. Women were among those to whom He gave the command to preach the Gospel to the whole world, and they shared in the experience of Pentecost. The clear record explicitly forbids the restriction of the meaning and authority of Pentecost to men. It was the beginning of a new day when men and women both were to be of the Christian priesthood and to fulfil the highest Christian office of prophecy: " But this is that which hath been spoken by the prophet Joel: And it shall be in the last day, saith God, I will pour forth of my spirit upon all flesh: And your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams: Yea, and on my servants and on my handmaids in those days will I pour forth of my spirit and they shall prophesy."

After Pentecost were the doors open for the service of women in the New Testament Church, or were women estopped from the ministry of prophecy and teaching? Assuredly the evidence is clear. It is explicitly stated that the four daughters of Philip the Evangelist prophesied (Acts xxi, 9). And there is no more interesting or significant character among all of Paul's helpers than Priscilla, who taught the way of God to the eloquent Apollos and who shared with her husband or whose husband shared with her in a com-

mon work. There were women who had churches in their houses (Rom. xvi, 5; Col. iv, 15). And Paul names at least seven women in the last chapter of the Epistle to the Romans with no intimation whatever of any difference of status between them and men. Some indeed count fifteen women's names and eighteen of men in this chapter. Paul rejoices in the activity of women as his fellow workers in proclaiming the good tidings (Phil. iv, 2, 3). And he recognized in writing to Titus the function of women of experience as "teachers of that which is good." Harnack maintains that there were many prominent women in the early Church enlisted in the propagation of Christianity, and they had equal rights and equal glory as martyrs. And what was a martyr but a witness? Are women to be free to testify to their Saviour by death and not in life? Might they not say a word of witness at the stake, and if then, why not at any time? (cf. Acts xii, 12; xvii, 4; xviii, 26).

It may be said that there were far more men than women engaged in the work of the Church, both in the Old and in the New dispensation. That would seem to be true. But perhaps the women worked with less publicity. And no doubt if all functions in the Church today were open to women there would still be, as in the Bible, a large preponderance of men. The nature of the work would lead to this result, just as it led to the selection of men alone as apostles. But the essential point is very simple. There is nothing in the Bible to warrant a discrimination against women as women or their exclusion as a sex from any work of God in His Church.

No one can read the Gospels and the Book of Acts and find there any evidence of the subjugation and subordination of women. They were in the company

of the disciples. They shared in the work and friendship of Christ. They were present at the giving of the Great Command to preach the Gospel to every creature. Women surely were among the creatures to be evangelized, and women were as surely counted among the evangelists. The remarkable thing about the Gospels and the Acts is that they take for granted throughout the place and part of women. All the ideals and obligations and privileges and endowments of the Gospel are for mankind, for men and women alike. The Gospels and Acts know no sex discriminations or distinctions whatsoever.

Miss Royden has called attention to this. While other great religions of the world have painstakingly defined the status of women, "Christianity alone has complimented them by ignoring them as women. Christ laid down no rules for women as separate from men. He talked with men and women alike; His teaching for one is teaching for the other. Compare, or rather contrast, the teachings of other great founders of religion. Everywhere you will find special teaching about women. Sometimes the teaching is of a very lofty order, and can be quoted with pride by those to whom the raising of the condition of women is dear. Sometimes it is base and unworthy. But always there is some special teaching about the virtues, the ideals and the sphere of women. Only in the religion of Christ is this special teaching entirely absent. Only with Him do we find that virtue is one and to be arrived at by both sexes, by the whole human race; only in Him is there no suggestion that courage, independence, self-reliance, and wisdom are to be special ideals of men, while obedience, submission, subordination, patience, and the like are virtues to be required of women. . . .

No wonder the response of women to the teaching of Christ was quick and universal. No special teaching that could have been given in terms, however reverent and noble, could have had so liberating, so far-reaching, so revolutionary an effect as this serene and deliberate ignoring of any fundamental differences in the quality of the humanity of those to whom Christ spoke."

But it is contended by some that St. Paul taught, under inspiration, a doctrine of inequality, of subordination of woman to man, and that he especially forbade the public work of women as preachers, as evangelists, as teachers, as administrators of the Church. As to the public teaching of women we are reminded of his explicit counsel in I Cor. xiv, 34, 35, and I Tim. ii, 11, 12.

"Let the women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but let them be in subjection, as also saith the law. And if they would learn anything let them ask their own husbands at home; for it is shameful for a woman to speak in the church."

"Let a woman learn in quietness with all subjection. But I permit not a woman to teach, nor to have dominion over a man, but to be in quietness."

Now, it is notable that these are the only two passages in the whole Bible that can be cited as apparently adverse to the position which is here set forth—four verses, it has been pointed out, out of thirty-one thousand one hundred and seventy-three verses in the Bible. And there are scores, if not hundreds, of verses sustaining our position. Surely the only right rule of interpretation of these four verses is the rule that "whatever we may elsewhere find in Scripture as allowed to be within the privileges of womanhood, cannot be forbidden here." Furthermore, if these passages are not to

be reasonably interpreted, but are to be pressed as mechanical and literalistic laws, then women must stop teaching Sunday School classes; they must give up their missionary societies, and those who have gone out as home and foreign missionaries, who far outnumber the men, must be recalled and silenced. If a woman is never to teach a man, how is Priscilla's course to be justified (Acts xviii, 26), and how are women warranted in teaching Bible classes of men or boys? And is she never to pray except when veiled? (I Cor. xi, 5). If those who rest their case against the equal rights of women in our churches on these two passages are not prepared to accept all the consequences of their contention, then they may not be allowed to contend at all on the strength of the supposed authority of St. Paul. All that is reproved in these passages is " a disorderly and immodest speaking on the part of women in the midst of communities where such speaking was by public sentiment looked upon as savouring of impurity." Public orderly prophesying by women is recognized (I Cor. xi, 5).

If any one has any doubt as to the real meaning of these two passages, or as to the teaching of the Scriptures on the whole subject, he should read the old pamphlet by Dr. George P. Hays, from which I have quoted. There, with whimsical good sense and unanswerable logic and exegesis, the truth is set forth as to the real consistency of the Bible and as to its heavenly doctrine of the rights of all, men and women alike, in the Church, which is the body of Him in whom there can be neither Jew nor Greek, neither bond nor free, no male and female, because all are one in Christ Jesus (Gal. iii, 28).

Here is the great charter of human equality. Here

we are, beyond all question of documents and precedents, at the very foundation of spiritual principle, deep in the purpose of God in Christ. Here is ultimate authority. And here is no warrant for discrimination on any ground whatever but capacity for service, regardless of sex. And there is no ground either in Scripture or in reason for the view that man's " functions " include such service in the Church and that woman's " functions " do not. Whatever men and women can do to serve God and man, to make Christ known and to establish the Kingdom of God, they have a right and a duty to do.

And it must be noted that this comprehensive and commanding assertion of absolute equality in Christ and in His Body, the Church, is from St. Paul, who is supposed to have held and taught the doctrine of sex inequality and of the subordination of woman to man. Paul no more taught this than he taught slavery or autocracy. He sent a runaway slave back to his master and he counselled master and slave as to their mutual relationships. He recognized the authority of Rome and the absolute rule of Cæsar, and he counselled political submission. But that did not mean that he set his approval upon slavery and autocracy as approved social and political institutions to endure forever. So he recognized existing social usages as to family life, but he proclaimed no principle of sex inequality in the Gospel or in Christ or His Church. Quite the contrary. All are one and equal in Christ Jesus.

But it is said Paul clearly recognized the subordinate and inferior status of woman:

" For Adam was first formed, then Eve. And Adam was not beguiled, but the woman being beguiled hath fallen into transgression " (I Tim. ii, 13, 14).

" But I would have you know that the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man; and the head of Christ is God. For a man indeed ought not to have his head veiled forasmuch as he is the image and glory of God: but the woman is the glory of the man. For the man is not of the woman; but the woman of the man: for neither was the man created for the woman; but the woman for the man" (I Cor. xi, 3, 7, 8, 9).

" For the husband is the head of the wife as Christ also is the head of the Church; being himself the saviour of the body. But as the Church is subject to Christ, so let the wives also be to their husbands in everything" (Eph. v, 23, 24).

Yes, but Paul also says: " Nevertheless, neither is the woman without the man, nor the man without the woman, in the Lord. For as the woman is of the man, so is the man also by the woman; but all things are of God" (I Cor. xi, 11, 12). " Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the Church, and gave himself up for it" (Eph. v, 25). " For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of the body, being many, are one body: so also is Christ. For in one Spirit were we all baptized into one body, whether Jews or Greeks, whether bond or free; and were all made to drink of one Spirit. And whether one member suffer, all the members suffer with it; or one member is honoured, all the members rejoice with it. Now ye are the body of Christ, and severally members thereof" (I Cor. xii, 12, 13, 26, 27). "And have put on the new man, that is being renewed unto knowledge after the image of him that created him: where there cannot be Greek and Jew, circumcision and uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bondman, freeman; but

Christ is all, and in all" (Col. iii, 10, 11). And his whole conception of the Gospel and of the Christian life takes in all alike on the same basis of obligation and privilege. Make a list of the great universals in Paul's Epistles, the "alls" and the "ones," and see how comprehensive they are. All divisions of race and colour and nationality and sex fade away and disappear in the family of the One Father and the Church of the One Lord and Saviour Who died for all and in Whom all live.

But the general principle and doctrine is conceded by many who still hold that there are diversities of functions between men and women, and that women ought not to be admitted to ecclesiastical office. There are indeed differences of function, but do they include or involve this discrimination? If the New Testament teaching is not against the freedom and right of women to render any service they can in the Church, then the only questions are, first, are women capable of service in ecclesiastical office, and second, even if they are, is it advisable that they should be eligible? As to the first question, it is certainly indisputable that there are some women who are far more capable to discharge efficiently and helpfully the duties of the Christian ministry and other Christian offices than some of the men who are now in these positions. All that any one would propose would be that such women should not be debarred simply on the ground of sex. As to the question of advisability it is argued that "women don't want such opportunities," to which it may be replied that some do and some do not, and that no man is required to exercise all his rights; that "women do want these opportunities and will crowd out the men," to which it may be replied, that men have the right to enter the ministry and

are not overcrowding it, that where these doors have been opened to women they have not as yet thronged into them, and that the difficulty will probably be just what it is with men, namely, to get enough of the right kind; that "men and women can't work together," to which it may be replied, that they do elsewhere, and that the Church ought to be and is the best and easiest place for such unity; that "if women are made eligible, men will leave the work to them," to which it may be replied, that in politics and law and medicine and business, all open to women, men have not withdrawn; if they withdraw from the Church the defect will be not in the Church nor in the women, but in the inferior character of men; that "sex equality will end the separate and distinctive organizations of women," but men have full ecclesiastical rights, and their distinctive organizations have not ended; that "all such issues needlessly agitate the Church and interfere with its concentration upon its central business, and especially upon its accessibility to the Holy Spirit of God," to which it may be replied, that the equal service of all by all is the central business of the Church, and that the Scriptures know nothing of a purely masculine Pentecost.

The central question of a differentiated sex function does not enter into the problem of equality in the Church. The only specialization of function and activity in the Church is according to capacity, and not according to sex. And this is a fundamental principle in life. Service is according to capacity and opportunity. It does not rest on sex. It is true that only women are mothers and only men fathers, but not all women are mothers and not all men fathers. Statements of function in the Church or State which are identified with sex are contrary to the facts of life. The majority of

the United States Supreme Court has even gone to the length of holding that it is the duty of citizens, including female citizens, "by force of arms to defend our government against all enemies, wherever necessary." One may disapprove the view that women should be equalized with men as soldiers in the State, and still recognize that they should be equalized with men as the peaceful soldiers of the Cross.

Indeed, it would be a strange and anomalous thing to deny equality in the Church, which is the very fountain of the principle of equality. It is Christ who has made woman free and equal. Is she to be allowed this freedom and equality everywhere else and denied it in the Church, where freedom and equality have their origin and their true home?

The Christian churches on the foreign mission field, growing up amid the non-Christian religions and made up of men and women who have come out of these religions, are apprehending the measure of the Gospel better than we. These women have been emancipated by Christ. They owe to Him their sense of personality and of human worth, of liberty, their right to all that is the right of man, the joy of equal opportunity of worship and work, of character and action, in the Church and in human life. Are they not also the children of God and dowered with all the rights and privileges of His children? God shuts no doors to His daughters which He opens to His sons.

It is interesting to note how far some of the churches on the mission fields have gone. Women are deacons and elders, and even ministers, though exceptionally, in Japan. In the Anglican Church in Persia women are ordained as lay evangelists and are members of vestries in China. There are twelve women on the supreme

governing body of the Church in Uganda. It is anticipated that they will be on an equal status with men in the Church of Christ in China. In the Swedish missions, women vote as elders with the same standing as men, and so also in the Danish churches in Manchuria. In the Celebes Dutch missions the women preach. And in the International Missionary Council meeting in Jerusalem, March 24 to April 8, 1928, the following resolution was unanimously carried, although the published report tucks it away in a small-type footnote: "That the principle and ideals which this Council has adopted in the report on racial relationships with regard to equal rights for races, it declares and maintains also with regard to the equal rights of men and women in and between all races."

The Church needs today all that women can bring into it. If there are women who, as elders, evangelists, or as ordained ministers, can serve the Church better than the men to whom otherwise the Church would be confined, the Church ought to be free to command their service. There will be such women. Probably there will not be as many as the Church needs. The fear that if the whole work of the Church is opened to women they will crowd out men so that men will withdraw from the work and leave it to women, is a groundless fear. The diaconate has long been open to women, and there are useful women deacons, but they are too few. It is to be feared that the women will be too few in other positions. But even so, there will be a great gain in making men and women equal. The door will be fully open to all that women can give and do. And the reproach of the past, that the Church alone denies to women the principle of Christianity which has gone out from the Church over all the rest of life, will be

once and for all removed. We shall have done right, and that is all that we need to do.

But some still say that it is inexpedient or premature. It is not inexpedient to do what is right. And it is scarcely premature to do late what through the influence of Christ has been already done in realm after realm of life, and what only now we are coming so tardily to do in Christ's own Body, the Church.

XIII

CHRISTIAN IDEALS OF EDUCATION

WHAT is the great end of education? We would hold that end, truly defined, to be citizenship, the training of persons in order that they may be adequately prepared to fulfil all their duties and relations in organized human society. It is no doubt possible to define the ends of education in terms of culture and of character, but we would believe these to be, if ends at all, only subordinate ends, and in reality not ends, but means toward the attainment of the real end that lies beyond them. Character and culture we would believe to be for the purpose of and obtainable only in the service of mankind and of God.

It is essential in thus conceiving education that one should construe aright the ideal of the society for which men are being prepared. Full citizenship cannot be adequately interpreted in any narrow racial or nationalistic or temporal terms. No one can question the place that race fills in the education of mankind, or the place that nationality has filled in the history of the world during the last four hundred years. But neither race nor nationality is a finality. We believe them to be departments essential to the school in which the different sections of mankind are being made ready for a larger unity. We believe them to be the divisions within which each different section can most readily

develop its own contribution, which it is then to bring at last into the common treasury of the whole. And the education of souls must be not for time only, but for eternity.

In conceiving education in these terms, two great things are discerned to be essential in it. It is its business to define clearly to young men and young women who are to be the architects of the new day, the right ideals for their own lives and for human society, and it is its business to lead them to those fountains of moral energy and reinforcement, drinking from which they shall be enabled to make these ideals which shine before them actual realities. If there ever was a time in human history when this function or this conception of education was necessary to the world's welfare, that time is today. If any one argues before us now that there is something radically awry about the world we are living in, we have no disposition to disagree with him. We believe that there are wrong things that need to be set right; that there are crooked things that need to be made straight; and that the new day can only come when men have a clear apprehension of what these wrong and crooked things are, and are furnished with the moral resources that shall enable them to translate their dream of a better and more righteous time into the actual experience of mankind.

It is here that our difficulties arise. What are the radically wrong things that must be set right? What are the crooked things that need to be made straight within human society? There are many on every side today who are prepared to point them out to us. Political parties with which we have to act, have sought, each in its turn, to set out its programme, to

hold out its ideals, to indicate to us some of the processes by which these goals are to be won. But we have the deep feeling that all of these things might be conceivably carried through and yet we find ourselves not very much nearer the great ends that we seek. Can we in this day, for the guidance of the young men and young women whose duty it is to see that the world we have lived through is ended and that a new and different world is begun, see clearly enough ourselves to hold up before them the ideals for their own lives, the ideals for social development, which will help them to play their part intelligently and efficiently in changing the old order and bringing in the new? It is, as one standing among the young men and young women who are to do this work, that one would like to speak to the responsible guides of American education today.

I

We have first of all to set for the young men and young women who are to make our world a fundamentally different principle and spirit of human relationships. We have to replace in some fashion, and completely, the old principle of competition by a radically different principle of co-operation. It is a commonplace statement to put in words, but it is not a commonplace thing when we look out on life and see the reasons for the necessity of the change.

We have lived through a day when our most trusted leaders have taught us that the necessary life for mankind was the jungle life, that all human progress could be won only as strong forces put down and out the weaker forces, that gain could be won by individuals

or nations only at the loss of other individuals and other nations. That has been a popular result of the doctrine of struggle and development in which we have been schooled for the last fifty years. There were great teachers even who in the name of that principle antagonized all forms of protective legislation that were designed to throw around weak wills safeguards which those weak wills did not find in themselves. Professor Sumner used to argue against all prohibitory legislation in the liquor traffic and many other forms of legislation as well, because these were only making sure that society would continue to be cursed by its weak elements. If a man did not have a strong enough will to save himself from being a drunkard, the faster he drank himself into the grave, the better for society, and the quicker we would be left with the men who had strength of will enough within to protect themselves, without nursery legislation on the part of society.

This competitive idea has lain at the base of all our modern economic life. There was a convention held in Cincinnati, not long before the end of the War, reports of which were published in the newspapers with captions like these, " The War That is to Come After the War," and the idea was of course that in the new commercial life that was to follow the cessation of military strife, the old principles were the only principles on which the world could be carried on, that for one nation to gain, other nations must lose. It was a warfare in which the strong would carry off the booty and the weak be driven back against the wall. It is that principle that has begotten no small fraction of our wars. I do not say that it has produced them all, but the wars that spring out of national ambition or na-

tional greed, and many if not all the wars that spring from economic roots, had at their base the principle of competitive strife as the necessary principle on which alone human life could be organized and social progress won.

Now these ideas rest on a conception of humanity which we are slowly learning to repudiate, on a conception of humanity which ought to have been repudiated hundreds of years ago, as Christianity did repudiate it, a conception which conceives the world as a great jungle of warring forces where the strong profit at the expense of the weak. We begin to recognize now that humanity is a great organism, and to conceive of it exactly as a man conceives of his body; so that it would be as irrational to apply the principle of competition to human society as to apply it to our own bodies. As if our hand should say, " I have first chance at the food, therefore I will hold this food as my own, and the mouth shall have no part in it, nor the eye nor the ear." The whole body is one. If one member suffers, every other member suffers with it, and no member can gain save as the whole body shares in that gain.

We are slowly beginning to see that this biological principle is the principle on which we have to organize the economic and political life of the world. What is Thomas Hardy doing in " The Dynasts " save interpreting human history in terms like these, conceiving it as one great organism,—all that was, all that is, and all that is to be, in one common organic life? It is indeed as a mechanism that Hardy regards it—but his imagery is translatable into truer forms. And what are some of the ablest and most honourable men we have in America, whom some politicians denounce

as "international bankers," trying to do except to construe the economic life of the world in terms of the facts as to the real constitution of mankind. We must realize that all mankind can profit only as every section of mankind profits, and that no section of mankind can permanently gain at the expense of any other section, that America cannot isolate herself economically from the rest of the world, imagining that she can pile up wealth at the loss of other nations. How can we gain anything from other nations for any long time unless those other nations continue to gain mutually by the same processes by which their trade advantages us? We have to realize that the world must be remade on this radically different principle. The relationships inside each nation economically, the relationships between all nations, must repudiate the falsehood that has organized these relationships in the past, and give us, instead of the old law of conflict and competition, a new law of co-operation and service.

That does not mean that the principle of rivalry goes out of human life. We know well enough in every educational institution the place of rivalry in the winning of excellence. But it changes the things for which men enter into rivalry. It makes them rivals, not to see who can amass to himself the largest share of what is produced, but rather to see who can put forth the largest energies in the field of production. It leaves men to compete still, only no longer under the principle of gain, but under the principle of use. And the education, scientific or ethical or economic, that is training the next generation to live on under the old ideals is simply seeking to perpetuate a discredited and outworn order. We must raise up a new generation of men

and women who will seek to live by the diametrically opposite law.

II

In the second place, we must teach the new generation to elevate personal values above all material and property values. Now, it is not hard to see how in primitive social states, which knew only subsistence measures, property values rose above personal values. Here in the tribe a man owns a stone axe. His father and grandfather wrought on that axe until it is now the best axe in the tribe. The man who owns that axe is economically the equal of five ordinary men. It is not hard to see that its owner and the tribe will value that material thing over against at least four human lives.

And here is a man in the tribe who has a knife, as Mowgli had among the jungle folk. For purposes of war or for purposes of work, the knife's possessor is equal to ten men. It is not hard to see that he will kill many men before he will lose his knife. In that primitive society that knife will be valued at least at nine times the value of a human life. In productive and protective power it is worth that much. And that society thinks in no higher terms. But the pitiful thing is that these ideals continued in social development after the primitive stage of human society had passed away. Even after personal values began to emerge in their true significance, the old ideals lingered on. They were embodied in our penal legislation down to the beginning of the last century, in the laws that punished a debt by taking away the productive power of the debtor, and made petty theft a capital offence. Thurlow Weed tells us in his autobiography of his

boyhood as a child in the village of Catskill on the banks of the Hudson River. He was the son of an honest drayman, whom misfortune ever pursued. His horse would back off the dock or some one would owe him money and refuse to pay. The family was always in penury despite his toil. Again and again the father would be cast into prison for debt. And Thurlow says that the dearest memory of his childhood days was when he would go down to greet his father at the prison on Sunday, when the prisoners in the debtors' prison were allowed to come out on the day on which work was forbidden. All the day long the father and the little boy roamed to and fro within the limits permitted. Because he owed a little to society, society took away from him the power to contribute enough to cancel his indebtedness. For debt, a man's personal worth, even his economic worth, was obliterated. How long and how tenaciously those notions clung.

I read not long since a Scotch biography, the life of J. P. Struthers of Greenock. Struthers grew weary of hearing about "the good old times" in Scotland, and he prepared a lecture on the subject, "A Hundred Years Ago in Scotland and Now," to show exactly what the social, religious and economic conditions in Scotland were at the beginning of the nineteenth century. Nobody who heard that lecture ever cried again for "the good old times." Among the incidents of his lecture he told of the execution in Glasgow of two boys for stealing eight and sixpence. We know how long our penal legislation was disfigured by such ideas of the exaltation of property over persons. It was one of the great warfares that Christianity began—to change this ideal. Its Founder held that no religious

institution, like the Sabbath, was to be held sacred against personal values, that one little child's soul was worth all that could be counted or weighed of wealth.

It is hard for us still to rid ourselves of the old traditions. If one begins to talk in these terms, the economic bourbonism of our time at once denounces him as one who wishes to undermine the foundations of society. But if we wish to build a new world we cannot build it on the old economic values. We must build it on the new. And the new alone can save us. Our only safeguard against the communistic tendencies that pulse across the world today, is to help men to see that private ownership in property, for example, finds its deepest and most sacred sanction in its necessity to the preservation of the rights of personality and the maintenance of the independence of the individual. What freedom is there for an individual when there is communism of land? Does the villager in India have any freedom to adopt a new faith? Does he have any freedom to follow his own conception of duty? The community starves him out. It will not let him work on the community land if he does not surrender to the community judgment. It is only when the private individual can stand on his own possession and say, " This is mine, out of this I draw my sustenance," only then that he is securely free and that we have a sure and impregnable foundation laid for independence and personal liberty.

Man in this new day is to breathe a larger freedom than men have ever breathed before, for he is to know new liberties and new emancipations, of which the old order knew little, powers that are not to be enslaved are to be set in the first place of value, and

all other values, many and real, are to be derived from them.

III

In the third place, in this new day we have to help the generation that is rising to find the principle on which all education fundamentally rests: I mean the principle of unity, that truth and life are one. Long enough have we constructed the institutions of men on the idea of division, stressing the things that separate, the discords. No one denies the place that party government has played in human history. No one denies the place it has played in our own national life. But when it has come to the great national crises, it has had to be laid aside. We simply have to realize that days come when issues rise so great that in the face of those issues all principles of division must yield to the deeper principles of cohesion and solidarity and unity.

During the last years in our own nation, what a spectacle have we presented! It is not appropriate to express one's personal convictions as to the distribution of responsibility and of blame, but one can lament the obvious fact that we who could be one in the great crisis of war have found it impossible to be one before the still greater crisis of peace. We could be one for tearing down, but not one for building up. We could be one for ripping open an old world, but we could not be one for unitedly laying the foundations of the new.

When we express the principle of unity over division it seems to many people mystical and nebulous. But it ought not to be so, for the principle that lies nearest to us, that we know most about, is the principle of

unity. We have it in the family. That is what the family is built on. We have three great institutions, the institution of rights, called the state, the institution of duties, called the Church, and the institution of affections, which we call the family. And this last was first and will be last. Its principle is indissoluble unity. You cannot destroy it. My father cannot unson me. I cannot unbrother my brother. You may break up the family life, but the fact of unity is there still, an indestructible reality. For my part I believe with all my heart in the Roman Catholic view of the indissolubility of the human family. And this ideal of unity, as constituting the principle on which we are of necessity going to rebuild the world, is the principle which we must find a way to apply within the state and to the whole world life of man.

IV

It would be an easy thing to multiply these new ideals by which the next generation is to live and do its work if it meets its duty. I will add only one other to these three, out of the many that throng into one's mind. We have somehow to make stronger among the young men and the young women who are to live in this new day the conscience and consciousness of the sense of diffused leadership, of collective social responsibility. Too much is said in our colleges and universities still about individual leadership. Too much is made of the isolated characters in human history as furnishing models and ideals for the generation that is to come. The day for that has gone by. There was an old monk in the twelfth century who used to say that the day of the Son had passed and that the day of the Spirit was at hand. What he meant was

that the time for isolated leadership had gone, that the world was to depend on collective and associated leadership. There was truth and error in his view. The truth of it we are not getting clearly enough before the conscience of the coming generation of men and women. We are talking to them still the old language about the old kind of leadership. We say to them, "Stand up in front of your mirror and behold a leader; get ready now to go out into the new generation where men are waiting to hear your voice and to follow your call." We are likely to breed a generation of prigs by this process, and not a new generation of men and women who realize that the day of that kind of leadership is past, that the time is come for a totally different sort of leadership for social reconstruction.

Philip Gibbs, in one of his articles, takes Anatole France's despair about Europe as his text, that Europe is not altogether dead, but is dying fast. Only Gibbs will not go as far as France. He believes still there is a possibility of life for Europe and the world, a possibility that can be realized if great unselfish leadership arises and the voice of a prophet is heard. The voice of no new prophet will be heard in our day. But the new day nevertheless waits for the prophetic voice, the collective prophetic voice, the voice that will be born out of the sense of corporate honour, made strong and resistless in our higher institutions of learning, that shall give men a strength not drawn from a sense of isolation from their kind, but springing from their consciousness of unity with their kind and with those great forces that have moved all through history and are moving, more strongly and powerfully today than ever, and from the spirit and power of Christ who lived and died in the vision of a new world and to

make that new world possible, and who, living now, is the only individual leader that the new generation needs. Thus shall be bred into the new generation that sense and conscience of collective leadership on which the building of the new day depends. We do not need to postpone long its coming. Today might be the dawn of it, if for that for which ten million men thought they were dying we should now realize that it is our business to live and to lead the men and women whom we are training to live.

The foregoing chapter was delivered as an address at the Semi-Centennial of the University of Ohio, in 1920, under the subject, "The Ideals and Principles Which Should Be Laid Upon the Lives of Young Men and Young Women in Our Universities." One of the university presidents who heard it wrote, a few days afterward, as follows:

"My dear Mr. Speer:

"I listened with very great interest to your address at the University of Ohio, at Columbus, on October 13.

"I wondered at the time, and I have wondered many times since, whether you have thought down deeply, so as to be absolutely sure that you are right in the several propositions you develop. . . .

"Frankly, I think that, with the single exception of the matter of property, I did not find myself in agreement with you at all. What you say about co-operation and competition is susceptible of grave criticism. You may be right, but I wish you would make sure.

"What you said with reference to unity, carried out logically, means internationalism, pure and simple, and the utter abrogation of nationalism. In this I am sure you are

wrong. It is a dangerous doctrine to preach, especially in the present crisis of world affairs.

"I am sure that you will pardon me for writing in this frank way. . . . All I ask is that you review over again the implications of the several points of your address so that you may be absolutely sure that you are preaching truth, and not insidious error."

To the above letter I replied as follows:

"My dear Dr. ———:

"I am sincerely grateful for your kind letter. It was a friendly thing for you to do, and I am glad to have the opportunity to answer your questionings. There must have been something very clumsy in my way of stating things at Columbus, or, as sometimes happens, the occasion and the mode of approach did not fit, or you surely would not have come away with the feeling of disagreement of which you write. What I said seems to me to be nothing but the simplest teachings of Christianity, and those teachings of Christianity, moreover, which the strongest and best tendencies in human thought and action have been trying to express for many years and are more and more succeeding in expressing. I do not see how any one can read the New Testament, on the one hand, or know, on the other hand, the literature of the last twenty-five years and the thoughts of men today without perceiving this. The fact is, as Mr. E. S. Martin says, that 'Christianity has broken loose in the world again.'

"You ask whether I am sure that I am right. I think I am. I well know how easy it is for men to be intellectually or morally colour blind and to be surest that they are right when in fact they are dead wrong. Our Lord told His disciples that those who killed them would conscientiously believe that they were serving God. The history of thinking is the history of unconscious self-deceptions. But we Christians have our court to appeal to. We at least can bring

our ideas to the test of the standard of the New Testament. And every one of the points I tried to make at Columbus seems to me to be an elemental teaching of the New Testament. Indeed they all seemed so obvious that I was afraid they would appear commonplace to that audience, and I was only encouraged by Phillips Brooks' principle that before such audiences the wise thing for a Christian man to do is to state fundamental Christian truths in the simplest and plainest way he can.

"I tried to make six points in my address. Two were preliminary.

"(1) The first was that the end of education is citizenship, to prepare men to fulfil all their relationships in organized human society, that character and culture are essential values which are not the end of education in citizenship, but are means to that end to be won only through it. (2) That such citizenship must be adequately conceived, that race and nation are facts belonging to it, but that its end is the citizenship of all humanity and of all eternity foreseen in St. John's city: 'And the nations of them which are saved shall walk in the light of it; and the kings of the earth do bring their glory and honour into it. And the gates of it shall not be shut at all by day; for there shall be no night there. And they shall bring the glory and honour of the nations into it.'

"Education that was to accomplish such ends and to fit men to carry the world forward into a better and truer order, I went on, must present to them the ideals of such an order and introduce them to the sources of moral energy and re-enforcement by which such ideals could be realized, and I named four such ideals. I described them in economic or general terms, as the occasion required, but are not all of them indisputably Christian?

I

"The law of gain must yield to the law of use, selfishness to service. The principle of competition must be displaced

by the principle of co-operation. The former conceives human life as a struggle between strong and weak and human progress as the elimination of the unfit by the fit, for the advantage of the fit. We repudiate this conception of human society. We believe humanity to be an organic whole, a body which must suffer or be honoured together, whose true law of life and progress is not internecine struggle, but mutual brotherly effort to achieve gains in which all share and in which the profit of each is not the loss of others, but the profit of all.

"This is the Christian doctrine. Luke xxii, 25-27; Mark x, 45; Rom. xii, 4, 5; xv, 1; I Cor. xii, 12-27; Gal. vi, 2. It is the conception of history and politics which some scholars set forth long ago, and which is at last slowly making its way into all men's minds. Orestes Brownson had clear glimpses of it. It is the principle of the new economics. Judge Gary got the steel manufacturers together in a partial acceptance of it. Bankers like Mr. Lamont and Mr. Davison see it clearly. The new Chinese Consortium is a recognition of it. Mr. Gompers ostensibly repudiates it, holding to the idea of a necessary conflict of interest between capital and labour, but I think in his heart as a brotherly human being he accepts it. All men must accept it except bad men or the colour-blind. It is the simple fact about the constitution of God's family, humanity. This fact does not exclude rivalry, but it does change its object. It becomes rivalry in service, not in profit.

II

"Personal values must be recognized as above and behind material and property values. This, too, is the clearest Christian teaching. Matt. vi, 24; vii, 12; xvi, 26; I Cor. iii, 11-13. Christianity, not so say any religion whatsoever, or even any spiritual view of life, rests on this judgment of values. It was one meaning of the Incarnation and the Crucifixion, and it was just what the Resurrection asserted—the spirit sanctifying all things, and yet supreme over all

things. The contrary estimate of property as superior to persons, long controlled men's thoughts and lasted on into the penal legislation of modern times. Political economy was written in terms of things, and nineteenth century industry rested on that economy. But the Christian view has won its way. Materialistic opinions are now, for the most part, held deliberately only by some of our college faculties or by red factions. The world doesn't hold them and the war experience discarded them. And economics and industry and politics recognize the personal factor as the central factor. President Hadley told me once that he was writing a new book on economics from this viewpoint. I pointed out that this recognition of the supremacy of personal values was the true sanction of private property; that private property was essential to the security of individual freedom and the right of personality; that the new day must be a day of richer freedom, of ampler and larger persons, and that material wealth is meant to be tributary to this and not preventive of it. No class is free from the peril of forgetting these things.

III

"The principle and ideal of unity must prevail over the principle of division. This was the third point. Surely it is valid. Education rests upon it and seeks for it—the unity of truth and life. It is the central most distinguishing principle in Christianity, as is clearly seen from the study of comparative religion. And the New Testament teaching is unmistakable. Acts xvii, 26; John x, 26; xvii, 21; Eph. i, 10, 21, 23; iv, 4-6, 16, 25; I Cor, xv, 28; Col. i, 16, 17. All human history is the struggle of this principle against the forces which oppose it. It is the principle embodied in the human family, which, for that very reason, is the institution which has held mankind together. Partisan and separatist influences have their part to play in developing the possessions which are to be brought into the common inheritance. The forces of division and unity intermit and

oscillate, but all in the interest of the ultimate unity. Have you read President Tucker's 'My Generation,' and his studies of this oscillation? The modern world in sanitation and hygiene and in international finance has set itself resolutely for the achievement of unity on the broadest scale. We knew something of the meaning of it while the War lasted. It remains for us in the life of the nation and in world politics in peace to be as clear-sighted and as resolute. The principle of unity does not mean, as you suggest, internationalism in any evil sense. Nationality is obviously a part of the machinery of God's education of man. But the principle certainly does mean in the future new and truer forms and spirit of human organizations. Can any one think otherwise? Can he suppose that we have reached the goal? Is the work of Christianity achieved, or is human progress ended?

IV

"The last point had to do with the conception of leadership. I quoted the saying of a twelfth century monk about the passing of the time for personal leadership and the coming of the day of collective leadership. He was but paraphrasing Christ's word in John xvi, 7. My point was only an effort to make it plain that democracy means not no leadership, but collective leadership, and that our modern education should breed in men the sense of corporate honour and wisdom, the solidarity of common vision and loyalty. What hope is there for us if in a democracy, the people are not, under God, responsible and therefore both free and bound to do their own thinking? I know that there are many people in America who do not believe in democracy. I do. And I think our colleges ought to be its stronghold and that they should raise up men who think of all men as Christ did, and who as one with all men are open to the illumination which is available only to the body. This is no new idea. It is as old as Christianity, and older. John x, 34, 35; xi, 8-11; Acts ii, 17. Professor R. E.

Thompson set it forth in a great book, a generation ago, now too little read, ' The Divine Order of Human Society,' in which he quoted the New Testament passages which assert the collective principle in knowledge and progress. II Cor. iii, 18; Eph. iii, 18; iv, 13, 16. Who writes a book on psychology or social or political science today and does not recognize this principle?

"As to further authorities for these opinions, the New Testament, and the moral order of the world which confirms it, is enough for me. But it would be easy to cite a good part of the literature of the last generation. The dynamic and biological conceptions, which are in the New Testament, have crowded out in the living world the old static and mechanical notions.

"And these are surely the thoughts of the coming generations in spite of many of their teachers. This is what reassures us. The destructive influences of today, economic or social, bourbonism at one extreme and the red forces of communism or lawlessness at the other, can be overthrown only by truth or by authority resting upon truth. Each one of the four truths which I tried to set forth confronts and encounters these influences. There is no other way as effective of meeting and overcoming them. It would be easy to show this in detail if it were necessary. These truths are fatal to class dominion, whether or bourgeois or proletariat, to violence and disorder, to selfishness of individuals, group or nation, to disrespect for rights on one hand or to the substitution of rights, real or fancied, for duties on the other, to the warfare of interests which leave the non-combatant majority to bear the burdens, to whatever is wrong and to whatever is unbrotherly.

" I cannot conceive that you should disagree with these principles if once they are clearly stated, unless I am wrong in supposing that they are among the principles of Christianity. I can conceive that two groups would not agree with them. Those who reject the Christian ideals will disagree, and those Christians also who think that the Christian

principles are theoretically ideal but are applicable only in heaven or in a world which is perfectly Christian, and that meanwhile the opposite ideals are the only valid ones and that Christians must conform to them and must regard any effort to displace them with the Christian conceptions as revolutionary and wrong.

"I have written at too great length, but it has been difficult to write so briefly. I do thank you for your warm friendship, never more truly shown than in your letter, and with kind regard, I am,

"Very cordially yours,

"(Signed) ROBERT E. SPEER."

XIV

THE TRUE AND ABIDING BASIS OF CHRISTIAN MISSIONS

WHEN we are told today, as we so often are told, that Christianity has no right to interfere with other peoples' religions or to invade their culture, and are asked why we go abroad when we have not done our work at home, or intrude where we are not wanted, we cannot refrain from wondering how the early Christian Church ever justified itself in propagating the new religion. For the first Christians were confronted with all these objections in a far more emphatic and valid form than they can be urged today. What right had they to seek to supplant, with their upstart faith, the old religions of Judaism and of Greece and Rome? Those religions antedated theirs. The people to whom they preached Christ had their own faiths and their own gods, and in the case of Judaism it was the same God as the God of the Christians. If it is wrong to offer one religion to a people who already have another, then the early Church acted unwarrantedly. And what right, further, had these unlettered fishermen, followers of One who had attended no school, these simple men who knew nothing of the rich inheritance of the ancient world, to go out and thrust their message before the most finished culture of the age?

With what power and validity might it have been argued against the missionary enterprise of the early

Church that it had better stay at home until it had done its work there! Let it look to its unfinished, its almost unbegun, task in Judea and Samaria and Galilee. Was there no work for St. Paul to do in Jerusalem and Damascus, that he must needs go off to Europe, or even to Asia Minor, seeking a field of work? If religion may not be exported until it is nationally accepted and fully exemplified at home, the early Church certainly had no business setting out on its world propaganda. Was the world calling for such an enterprise? Not a bit of it. Paul tells of an appeal for help from a man of Macedonia, but he says frankly that it was in a dream, and the story of his activity is not an account of eager invitations and happy welcomes, but of hardship and hostility and opposition. The only freedom of cities which he received was the freedom of a forcible exit. He lists his experiences in his Second Epistle to the Corinthians, and he adds that his pleasures are not reception committees, welcoming banners, official invitations from civic councils, banquets and festivals, but reproaches, persecutions, derisions. What right, again it may be asked, if we are not to go where some people do not want us, had Paul to inflict himself and his mission upon people who had no desire for him?

All the contemporary objections with which we are familiar were applicable to the missionary zeal of the first Christians. What would have been the result if they had yielded to them? It would have been the end of Christianity. The new religion would have died at its beginning. If it is wrong to propagate Christianity now, it was so at the outset, and as that would have ended Christianity, it would follow that it has no right to exist at all. But if so, what right have the religions to exist which it is claimed Christianity has no right to

displace? Each of them had a beginning. Each of them displaced what had gone before it. If they had a right to supersede or to absorb what they found, so had Christianity at the outset, and so it has today.

That was the conviction of the first Christians, and instead of listening to our modern anti-missionary arguments, they went out to spread Christianity over the world, to destroy all that in the light of Christianity was false and to salvage and redeem and enrich whatever truth men had already found. Why did they do this? What were the considerations and motives which launched the Christian Church and its missionary enterprise across the world?

It is interesting to note that it does not appear to have been the last command of Christ or what we call "the great commission." Although fresh from the final interviews with Jesus, in which that command was given, no heed seems to have been paid to it. The early Church stayed in Jerusalem. It was only when persecution arose that it spread out, and its world mission came into full view only with Paul. Nobody spoke of "the great commission." And later, when questions arose as to the legitimacy of the mission to the Gentiles, or when Paul met luke-warmness and indifference among the Christians, how natural and conclusive it would have been to appeal to the last authoritative word of the risen Lord! Surely that would have settled the issues of the first Jerusalem Council and fired the Church with missionary zeal. But not a word of it. The last command of Christ is nowhere quoted in the work of the Church. That command, apparently, was not the basis of foreign missions.

And it is clear that the motive was not international goodwill. All the world which the early Christians knew

was one nation. Nor did they seek to spread a culture or a civilization, or even an ethic, though moral purity and moral passion were a part of their power. Their one motive and purpose and aim was to proclaim a message, to tell news, to deliver their witness, to make Christ known, hoping and striving to persuade men, but bearing their witness and telling their story, whether or no.

This is the fundamental basis of missions—namely, the essential nature of Christianity as a message of salvation, of the grace and love of God in Christ, the story of His life and death and Resurrection, the significance of His work and His person to individual men and to society and to the world. There is given in Christ that which is unique, indispensable, sufficient, complete and final. If we believe this, missions inevitably follow. If not, missions will fade out. We do not say that we know it all; we say just the opposite, that we do not know it all. St. Paul said: "We know in part." But it is all there in Christ. We do not need and we do not seek anything that is not in Him. In Him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily. Christianity is this faith. It is the declaration of this faith to the whole world. It is the effort to realize this faith ever more and more in human experience. Here is where the early Church stood. Here the foreign mission enterprise stands today. Its basis is in the very character of the Christian Gospel as the good tidings of the only Lord and Saviour of mankind.

Because of what Christianity is, it must be spread over the whole world and offered to every man. Every man and the whole world need it. The early Church believed that every man and the whole world were in desperate need of the Gospel. And this is what the foreign missions enterprise believes. Just as the unique

and uniquely supernatural character of Christianity has been glossed over, partly as a result of the misinterpreted study of comparative religions, so have we glossed over the depth and reality of the world's need. One reason for this has been the decent sense of our own need. But that is only a confirmation, not a qualification, of the fact of the need of humanity as one of the bases of foreign missions. All men need Christ, not Hindus and Moslems only, but Christians, too, and all equally. When we say that men are in dire need of Christ's salvation, we are not excepting or exalting ourselves. We are in the same need as all men, and all men in the same need as we. Another reason for glossing over the reality of human need has been supplied by the tide of nationalistic spirit seeking self-glorification. National and racial pride has set up a defense reaction with false idealization of the past. It begins now to seem that sensible and honest men are rising out of this self-delusion and facing facts. A good illustration of this new mind is found in Hu Shih's introduction to Julean Arnold's " Some Bigger Issues in China's Problems ":

" What is needed today, it seems to me, is that conviction which should amount almost to a religious repentance that *we Chinese are backward in everything and that every other modern nation in the world is much better off than we are.* We must know ourselves. We must confess that we are terribly poor and that our people are suffering miseries which justly horrify the civilized world. We must confess that our political life is corrupt to the core and that most of our homes are nests of crime, of injustice, of oppression, lynching and suicide. We must see with open eyes that we are ruled by militarists who arose from banditry and from the scum of society, and whose education and training never

qualified them to rule, and by politicians who have no livelihood other than politics, and who are never regulated by any system of civil service.

"And for all this we must have ourselves to blame. We have bound the feet of our women for a thousand years and smoked opium for centuries, thereby greatly weakening the race and polluting its moral fibre. And we have wasted the brains of our scholars by making them spend six long centuries mastering absolutely useless gymnastics for competition in the examinations. And we have resisted all pressure for reform and modernization, even in the face of the grave danger of the country being partitioned among the Powers. We are only reaping the fruit of the sins of our fathers and ourselves.

" Let us no longer deceive ourselves with self-complacent talks about imperialistic powers hampering our national progress and prosperity! Let us read the recent history of Japan and bury our conceit and self-deception once and for all in shame and repentance.

"And then when we have fully and whole-heartedly repented, let us resolve, solemnly and religiously resolve, that *we must learn.*"

China's plight and need are pitiable. But, after all, it is a matter only of degree. All other nations are in need, too. " The whole world," said St. John, with outspoken boldness, " lieth in wickedness." Smooth it and cloak it as we may, the fact remains. The world is wrong, and only Christ can right it.

Therefore, Christians must be a missionary people. They know of the only Saviour. The Gospel which they did not produce, but which was given to them, is the only hope of men. It is the only truth of God and of God's grace and love in Christ. It belongs to all men. It must be shared with all men. Any other course is a betrayal of the Gospel and a breach of Christ's trust.

XV

SOME RECENT CRITICISMS OF FOREIGN MISSIONS

THE kind of religion which we have been considering, by its very nature, is and must be missionary. It must be projected over the whole world. But foreign missionaries and the foreign missionary enterprise have no title on that account to exemption from criticism. And no such exemption is allowed them today. No doubt the criticism of all such movements and their agents is undulatory; at times the wave rises high and at times it drops down. Of late it seems to have risen. Illustrative expressions have been several articles in " The Atlantic Monthly," especially Mr. Mark M. Jones' "A Missionary Audit," in the issue of December, 1927, and Mr. Moore Bennett's " Christianity in China," in the issue of August, 1928, an article which " The Atlantic " should have been ashamed to accept. The religious press also has been represented by a series of articles in " The Christian Century " dealing especially with China and " The Debacle of Missions in China," and implying often the world-wide application of the writer's conceptions of missionary work in China, and quite apart from China finding a great deal requiring to be changed in the whole enterprise. This series has presented such titles as " New Wine Bursts the Old Missionary Bottles " (Feb. 19, 1925), "Again—' The End of Foreign Missions ' " (Feb .11, 1926), " Instead of Foreign Missions " (Feb.

18, 1926), " Why Young Missionaries Quit " (July 19, 1928), etc. These typical articles in two periodicals are illustrative. It would be easy to cite many others.

Many friends and adversaries, alike, of foreign missions have the impression that this wave of missionary criticism is higher and more significant now than ever. Whether it is more significant depends, of course, on one thing only, namely, whether it is more true. If it is finding and disclosing shortcomings or mistakes, or false and unworthy elements, even though they be conscientious, it will be in just the measure of such discovery and disclosure, both significant and wholesome.

But our question is as to whether this present day criticism is more intelligent and discerning than the old. It is certainly an error in the sense of proportion to think that it is more extreme and outspoken than in former days. Any one whose memory of missionary and anti-missionary literature reaches over a generation and whose knowledge of it goes back to the beginning of modern missions could readily produce the evidence that would set the present tide of criticism in its true proportion. I shall refer only to what is in one's own memory. Just as my own connection with the missionary enterprise began, a generation ago, a flood of critical or antagonistic discussions poured out from travellers like Curzon and Norman; from that most intelligent and trenchant student of missions in China, Alexander Michie, of the " Tientsin Press," in " Missionaries in China," and " China and Christianity "; from statesmen like Lord Salisbury and John Sherman; from newspapers like " The New York Times," in the West, in articles by Sydney Brookes, and " The Allahabad Pioneer " in the East, in India; from the new syncretism springing from the first approaches to the study

of comparative religion; and from many other sources on the platform and in publications. Some of the critics ingeniously posed as nationals of the mission fields, and Lowes Dickinson wrote his very clever "Letters from a Chinese Official," and Mr. R. F. Johnston, as Liu Shao Yang, appealed as a Chinese against Christian missions, with no intimation whatever of his deception. Much of the criticism was from people who did not believe in the missionary idea at all, and some of it was from those who did not believe in Christianity. But the two most effective critics were both Christians—Dr. R. N. Cust and Mr. Meredith Townsend.

Mr. Townsend was for many years editor of "The Friend of India," in Calcutta, in succession to Dr. George Smith, and later followed Richard Holt Hutton as editor of "The Spectator." His articles for years were among the most penetrating and philosophical of all contemporary discussions of the impact of Christianity on the Asiatic peoples. He was one who believed that Christianity had a missionary duty, but he despaired of its being able to fulfil it. Dr. Cust described himself on the title page of one of his books, "Essay on the Prevailing Methods of the Evangelization of the Non-Christian World," as "an observer in the field, a member of committees, an all-round reader of missionary literature in five European languages, and one whose heart and intellect have been devoted to the subject for fifty years, independent of church, denomination, or nationality." Dr. Cust was in the British service in India in the glow and high-mindedness of the Punjab group headed by the Lawrences, Edwardes, Montgomery, MacLeod, and others like them. On returning to England he became a member of the committee of the Church Missionary Society. He published

a series of books on missionary subjects in which with unsparing criticism he set forth his condemnation of all of which he disapproved in the ideals or methods of missionaries and missionary organizations.

What the foreign mission enterprise is meeting today in the way of criticism is often childish, and much of it woefully amateurish, in comparison with what it met thirty years and more ago. The Indian Mutiny in India and the Taiping Rebellion in China, in the middle of the last century, and the Boxer Uprising, as the new century began, brought with them and left behind them far more attacks upon foreign missions than have followed the present Chinese rebellion and what it was left for a Christian periodical to call "the missionary debacle." It has, however, nothing to do with the truth or falsehood, the good or the evil, of present day criticism to call attention to the fact that it is not new and that it falls far short of the older criticism in virulence and power, and those missionary folk who are frightened by it ought to turn their fears upon their own conceptions of the ground and ideal and true power of the missionary enterprise, all of which need fresh consideration, while some need reconsideration, and some call for solidification at the very points where current criticism would disapprove them.

Present criticism in the main is very different from the old. The newspaper comment, for example, is much more intelligent and appreciative than it used to be, in part because of a true appreciation of the purpose of missions and in part through new conceptions of their social and political bearings. And here one may note what will call for later comment, namely, the opposite views which critics take. Some newspapers commend missions for what they conceive to be their

relationship to Western civilization and others condemn them for the same conception. Much of the criticism of the past denied the right of Christianity to invade the area of other religions, and much of it derided the missionary and his idea. There is still some of this, but the few articles which have been mentioned as illustrative are illustrative also in this, that they do not in the most part question the validity of the foreign mission idea. They call rather for change of method or organization or spirit or personnel.

It is always a question how far it is worth while to answer irresponsible criticism. Men secure publication of articles, often for pay, who have made no adequate study of the things which they criticize, or who have themselves no stake or share in the undertaking. Other people are believing in it and making sacrifices for it, but the critic may be doing neither, and intending to do nothing, no matter what changes may be made. A man may leave the mission field and criticize those who remain for living exactly as he had lived while there and for pursuing methods which he himself had pursued. Since leaving the field he has come to believe that different methods would be better, but he did not adopt them when he had a chance, and he does not demonstrate them now. Or the critic may have an idea of the foreign mission undertaking which can easily be written up for publication, but which would never have produced the undertaking and would not sustain it today. It would yield neither the lives nor the support. These spring from the great consecrations which afford material for criticism, but not from a criticism which begets no great consecration. As a rule, probably it is best to let the critics go their way. Now and then a falsehood will need to be dealt with or

an injustice, which those who are themselves wronged would endure, needs to be called by its right name. But where criticism has an honest purpose, or even where it has not, the profitable course is to look at it and ask whether there is truth in it.

Indeed, the foreign mission enterprise criticizes itself far more within than it is criticized without. There could be made with little difficulty a list of reports, books, and articles by missionaries and missionary administrators which deal far more radically and intelligently with the problems of missions than the critics have done from without. No one ever dealt more vigorously with the problem of the relation of missions and education than Rufus Anderson, or of missions and subsidies than John L. Nevius, or of missions and economics than A. G. Jones, or of missions and governments than R. N. Cust, or of missions and society than J. C. Gibson, or of missions and national character than Guido Verbeck and Samuel A. Barnett, or of missionary administration than S. J. Clark. The foreign mission movement is full of shortcomings. It must inevitably be. Its central idea becomes confused. The great religious and theological convictions back of it become relaxed or distorted. Its best agents realize most their inadequacy. And all of its agents are not best. But so far as it is genuine and true it will go on, and criticism will help it and not hurt it. It will winnow and clarify, and while it may cut down the volume of support, especially the unjustified criticism that goes on within the Church and among the Christian people who ought to be supporting missions, all this will be beneficial. Foreign missions have always been a small minority cause, and will continue so. The worthwhile causes live by their worthwhileness, not by majority commendation.

The central questions concern, first, their fundamental worthwhileness, and, second, their general process and particular methods. As to the first point, the essential problem is simply the nature and worth of the Christian religion or, as we would rather say, of Jesus Christ our Lord and Saviour. There are those who object to the claim of Christianity, that Christ is unique, universal, and final. The foreign mission enterprise rests on this claim. But, even when this is nominally conceded, or where it is admitted that Christianity is the superior religion, it was formerly argued that foreign missions were wrong because they were presenting Christianity apart from and before the arrival of Western civilization. Modern criticisms, on the contrary, attack foreign missions for too great implication of relationship with Western civilization. Indeed, the same critics today will complain of foreign missions on wholly opposite grounds, on one side because it is too much mixed up with political and social ideals, and on the other side because it is not mixed up enough. The missionary must have nothing to do with government, either his own or that of the country to which he has gone, no relationship, as Cust held, "to the arm of the flesh." But the same critic will complain of the missionary because his message and mission are otherworldly and not sufficiently dynamic and upheaving in their political and social consequence. The critics demand that foreign missions must be at one and the same time both social and non-social.

It is this very demand for opposites, this contradictiousness of criticism, which makes it impossible to satisfy the critics. What one requires another repudiates. In China, for example, the Protestant missionaries are criticized both for too much and for too little

sympathy with the nationalist movement, for too much and too little deference to the authority of their own home governments, for too much Modernism and too much Fundamentalism, for too much educational work and for not enough, for too much and too little identification with the commercial communities from the West, for compromising tenderness toward China's old religious and ethical ideas and for ruthless condemnation of them. Individual missionaries may, indeed, be criticized on any one of these grounds, but they cannot be criticized for all of them, nor can the movement as a whole be held responsible for diametrically opposite positions. The critic ought to say that he is criticizing only particular persons, or he should prove that the charge he is making is true of the general body of missionaries and that the thing charged is wrong.

And what is true of China and of current criticism of missions in China is true of the whole undertaking. The critics annul each other. They demand that missions should be more simply evangelistic and more exclusively educational. They say that the native church is sycophantic and parasitical, and also that it is in rebellion against the missionary and his continued tutelage. They declare that missionaries should be about their primary business and let social and economic issues alone; and at the same time they call for the concentration of missions on the industrial and material betterment of local and national conditions. They deride the statistical reports and the supposed demand by the boards and home churches for statistical results; yet they propose, nevertheless, a set of more rigid statistical requirements and the application of statistical tests to missionary service in lieu of "vague generalities about the spiritual results of missionary effort."

They lament the lack of missionary sacrifice and the collection of missionaries in larger centres, and in the same breath condemn the single women missionaries who go off to live in the interior among the people. And such a list of contradictory demands could be lengthened indefinitely.

But the method of letting critics answer one another does not meet the queries with which the foreign mission enterprise ought always to be examining itself; and this brings us to the second point, covering general process and particular methods.

Like any human movement carried on by human agents, it has its weakness. It makes errors as to fundamental principles. Sometimes wrong principles are followed. Sometimes right ones are discerned, but practice is not adequately ruled by them. Men and women blunder. Some of them are not as good as they ought to be, and the good are not always wise. Working ideas change, or the language which expresses the same idea changes from decade to decade. Conditions inevitably alter. Foreign missions are doing their best to alter them, and other forces are at work resistlessly. Methods must be modified to meet new situations. It is quite conceivable either that foreign missions have been over institutional or that they have not been institutional enough, or that a new time is near when they shall be made either much less or much more institutional than they have been. If governments restrict the educational and medical work of missions the result may be a great expansion of evangelistic work with a new type but a smaller number, or possibly even a larger number of men and women who will proclaim Christianity in new evangelistic ways.

Some of the recent criticism suggests constructively,

that foreign mission work should be more fully consolidated in fewer denominations and missionary organizations, that missions should be carried on with greater continuity by a force with smaller overturn of personnel and with more specialized preparation and right of self-determination, that there should be more simplicity and frugality of living and expenditure on the part of missionaries with more adaptation to the style of life of the people, that the authority and judgment of the national Christians should be more fully recognized and the responsibility of the movement more fully transferred to the field. Something may be said briefly on each of these points.

As to church consolidation on the foreign field, it is well known that organic denominational union has prevailed much further there than at home. In all mission fields, for example, with one minor exception, all the Presbyterian and Reformed missions from the West have united in establishing and maintaining one native church. Their policy from the beginning has been to encourage united national Churches, and not to perpetuate themselves. The threadbare joke about the "Chinese Dutch Reformed Church" is a sheer invention; there never was such a church. It is to be hoped that this movement for national unification will proceed. Meanwhile it is wise to see and speak the truth. There is no such hopeless confusion in China and Japan and elsewhere as the critics allege. The territory is divided. The number of Christian denominations is small. The "poor people" are not bewildered by them. Either they do not know the difference or they see it to be far less than they are accustomed to in their own familiar religious divisions. And the hindrance in the way of larger unions in these fields is not in most of the

home boards. It is among the nationals themselves. Some of this is regrettable, but not all of it. The unity of the Roman Catholic Church is not a unity of such adequate reality as to suggest that any unity whatever is desirable just for the sake of unity. And the trust idea, whether in the Church abroad or in board unification at home, which is in the mind of some critics, the idea of big business consolidation, is not a wholly one-sided proposition. There is now more co-operation and common action in foreign missions than in any other religious service, and there ought to be still more of it, but there are other values involved than those which the mathematical efficiency expert takes into account. Overhead charges in the home administration ought to be reduced; but as a matter of fact the excess is not in administration. It is in promotion and the effort to secure added support, and in this respect each board carries on a conflict between the economists who would cut down and the business element which believes in advertising and in spending money to get more to spend on the work. There ought to be more church unity and more economy, but the practical question is, how to effect them.

Something more explicit should be said regarding the criticism of the expense of foreign missionary administration and its use of the money given for the work. In reality, no money begins to go as far as foreign missionary money. In medical work, compare the cost of foreign missionary medical service with medical service in the United States. Let us take one American hospital and compare it with the expense and work of the eighty-nine hospitals and one hundred and twenty-two dispensaries maintained by the Presbyterian Board. Study the following table:

	One American Hospital	*All Our Presbyterian Foreign Mission Hospitals and Dispensaries*
Earnings	$490,160	$540,605
Other income	$621,238	$58,640
Operating expense	$1,015,134	$599,245
In patients	4,402	59,093
Out patients	29,810	441,139
Visits and treatments	113,113	1,155,657
Cost per patient	$34	$1.36
Cost per visit	$8.97	.52

And if we consider only the money given, and not the earnings, the difference becomes more amazing. The money received by this one American hospital from endowment and as donations was $621,238. The total given for the eighty-nine mission hospitals was $58,640. Each dollar at home provided for less than one-twentieth of a patient. Or, to put it otherwise, it took $21 of benevolent gifts to care for one patient. Abroad, each dollar given by the Church in the United States provided for seventy-five patients. It would have required nearly a fourth of the Board's total expenditure to provide for the medical work on the scale of cost of this one home hospital. What it required a million dollars to do at home, the Board did abroad with less than sixty thousand. And yet foreign missions are called extravagant or inefficient!

This was a great city hospital, but not as great in its work as some single foreign mission hospitals. But any country hospital in America could be taken for illustration also. One in a New Jersey town cost, last year, $323,819 and treated 18,332 patients in clinic and in-patient work, or at the rate of $17 per patient as compared with $1.36 abroad.

In the cost of educational work, take this same New Jersey town and compare costs there with our foreign mission schools. The number of children in school in this town was 3,314, and the annual cost, $395,147, or $119 per pupil, for the year. In our Board's schools there were 110,653 pupils at a cost of $546,972, plus the salaries of foreign missionaries engaged in educational work, which might be estimated at $500,000, making an average cost per pupil of $9; and remember that in the American town cited the schools run only through high school, while our foreign mission schools include colleges, universities, and graduate schools.

The Board might have spent its whole outlay of $4,903,847 last year on its hospitals alone, and the expense per patient would have been $11, or less than one-third that of the city hospital cited. It might have spent its total outlay on its schools alone, and the expense per pupil would have been $44, or about one-third of the cost per pupil in the typical town used for illustration. If the Board's medical and educational work had cost as much as in these cases at home, it would have cost $13,167,707 for the medical, and $14,998,726 for the educational, or $28,166,433, instead of what it actually did cost, namely, $1,105,612. Where has money been used more economically and effectively?

But it is said the overhead for administration and promotion is excessive. "It costs a dollar to send a dollar" is the old canard. And some go even further and say that a still smaller per cent than one-half of the money given ever reaches the field. Well, what are the facts? I wrote them recently in answer to an honest inquiry as follows:

"It is a pleasure to answer your letter of inquiry with

regard to the cost of administration of our foreign missionary work.

"Our total receipts in the United States last year were $4,696,966.00. The cost of administration was $191,229.00, or about four per cent. The heavy item in overhead charges is not administration, but collection and promotion —the supply of literature to the churches and the work of secretaries of the Board and of the General Council in maintaining and increasing the interest in the home Church. The total amount of such expenditures, including interest on borrowed funds necessitated by the churches' delay in sending in their contributions ($10,846.00), and our Board's share of the expenses of the General Council, ordered by the General Assembly, ($115,182.00) was $469,000.00, or about ten per cent.

"In addition to the receipts from the home churches in America, however, the Board received for the work nearly $2,000,000.00 in fees, contributions, etc., from the churches, hospitals and schools on the mission field. Inasmuch as all this was part of the money administered, it ought to be included in estimating the percentages, and would reduce all of the percentages which I have given above by one-third.

"No one can feel more strongly than some of us do who have given our lives to the Foreign Missionary enterprise that the cost of promotion and administration should be reduced to the lowest possible figure. For years in our Board we held the total figure of expenditure on promotion and administration combined to less than five per cent, so that any one desiring to send a dollar to the mission field could do it far more cheaply through the Foreign Board than by attempting to send it independently. He would, moreover, receive an accounting of the expenditure of his money and be assured of its conscientious administration. I wish that we could get back to this lower ratio, and I hope that some day we can."

The impression that the losses and withdrawals in

foreign missions are excessive and that they are much larger now than in former days is of doubtful validity. It may be sound in the case of some denominations and some fields, but I cannot find that it is justified by the facts which have been gathered in the case of the Presbyterian Board. Outside of death, the losses from resignation and withdrawal, largely for health reasons, are less than 4 per cent of the missionary staff. By way of comparison, one of the greatest New York banks reports 17 per cent, one of the greatest life insurance societies 16 per cent, one of our greatest school faculties 10 per cent, an important steel industry 30 to 100 per cent, and in the dry goods organizations generally from 25 to 100 per cent. I submitted the facts to one of the best actuaries in the country, and he replied:

"A leaving rate of less than four per cent per annum is amazingly good, standing by itself. When it is remembered that a very large proportion of your staff consists of married persons and that in the case of such you have two resignations where you would otherwise have only one, it will be seen that the above figure, small as it is, is really inflated. I have no doubt that a study of the cause of resignation would be found reassuring.

"I find from the data which you sent me last December that the average term of service of those who resigned was a little over ten years for both men and women combined. For men alone it was a little over eleven years, and for women alone it was a little under ten years. Without having any definite information, I have an idea that these figures will compare favourably with the average pastorate in this country, without making any allowance for the difficulty which churches sometimes experience in getting rid of the poor sticks that are at times thrust upon them.

"I am afraid that the member of your board who ex-

pressed amazement at your turnover is not cognizant of what is occurring in business offices generally. The facts are a wonderful tribute to your organization."

But the tribute is to the service, not to the organization. And looking back over the past we have been unable to verify the impression that the overturn is greater now than it used to be. Perhaps this is due in part to the combined effort of our Board and its missions, while using short term workers, to adhere to the idea of life service. It has been the upheaval in China which accounts for large withdrawals the last years. But this is not a new thing. In the eighties there was a withdrawal of missionaries from Japan proportionately more serious. It began with the idea that the Japanese Church did not need more foreign missionaries and that their work was done, and it ended in the reaction in Japan against foreigners which led many foreign missionaries to think that there was no more place for them. And all this passed away so completely in Japan that young missionaries do not have it in their mind at all.

Undoubtedly there are losses due to the fact that young missionaries are disappointed in not finding the special work which they wanted to do. And these will continue, all the more perhaps if the ideal of one writer prevails: "A young person goes to the field full of hopes and energy. He wants to jump right into his task and get results. He should be encouraged to do so. In every other calling it is so; the hustler gets the prize; even in business in the so-called mission lands it is so." The young missionary who does this without waiting to learn the language will probably feel shortly that he has made his contribution and will leave soon. And

also he may find the situation more difficult as the native leaders take over direction and treat his specialized vocation less considerately than his missionary associates had done. There is assuredly a problem here ahead of foreign missions. Will the cause be able to secure and retain the same type of broad power and tenacious and adaptive personality which it has held in the past, or will young men who studied high school pedagogy or rural sociology be unwilling to continue in the work except in the fixed specialization of their student days? It would seem clear that in the transition from mission control to Church administration men and women will be needed of large capacity for adaptation and adjustment, who will set ends above means and who will be ready to serve where service is needed most.

The criticism of foreign missionaries for their scale and expense of living is both old and difficult. The effort of mission boards has been to provide a comfortable living salary that would relieve the mind of the missionary of any anxiety or care and leave him free to devote himself wholly to his work. It is believed that unmarried foreign missionaries, and foreign missionaries married but without children, have been thus cared for by their Church boards. The pressure has been on missionary families with children to educate. To meet their problems special schools have been supplied and increasing grants in the way of children's allowances have been made, but these fall far short of furnishing the educational cost when the children leave home or return to America for high school and college. The boards have not been able nor felt it their duty to do more. But the present criticism is against their doing as much as they are doing. A young missionary writer from Japan deals with this:

"The young worker finds the missionaries with whom he must work living on such a high standard of living as effectively to divorce themselves from the lives of those among whom they seek to do good. And it ought to be said, too, that the average missionary lives better on the field than all but the highest-salaried ministers at home. Now this is not altogether the fault of those now in missionary service. It is partly because when missions first came to these countries, land and labour and all material things were so cheap that large mission grounds were purchased as centres of work, huge houses were built, and a corresponding scale of living was adopted. Today the missionary, much as he would like to reduce his living expenses, finds himself forced to live in these grand but now decaying old establishments, with all the upkeep expenses they involve and the necessity of keeping enough servants to care for them.

"All this is wrong, not only in that it is a dreadful burden and keeps us from intimate relations with the common people who naturally have a suspicion of luxury, but also because living in such a style, with native servants to wait on us and being able on our foreign salaries to enjoy things which only the wealthiest natives can afford, inevitably creates in the missionary's mind a superiority complex which he would not otherwise have. Indeed, one wonders if such conditions are not largely responsible for that certain lassitude and dependence upon the services of others which even the young missionary soon begins to develop, if not ever on the alert."

And a writer in "The Atlantic Monthly" for August, 1928, charges that the Protestant missionaries in China are better paid than foreign business men—which is incredible, live in better houses, have summer residences, and know no such hardship and show no such consecration as the Roman Catholic missionaries.

Well, what are the salaries which foreign missionaries

receive? In India Presbyterian unmarried missionaries receive $1128 to $1175; married missionaries, $1884 to $1968. In Japan unmarried missionaries receive $1125; married missionaries, $2250. In China our unmarried missionaries receive $900 to $960; married missionaries, $1680 to $1800. In addition, house rent and medical care are provided and allowances for children ranging from $200 to $300 per child. Servants are cheaper in these lands than in America, but all other living expenses are becoming approximately even, and some are higher. Clearly there are no princely salaries here. And all are on one level together. When they come home to America the home salary on furlough ranges from $1200 for an unmarried missionary to $2100 for married, with the children's allowances continued the same as on the field, and with partial help in some boards for rent and medical bills. The average salary of Presbyterian ministers in the United States is $2500, inclusive of manse.

From the point of view of board administration all that can be said is, that the boards try to take honest and fair care of their missionaries. They do not believe that they are doing so on an extravagant basis. They do believe that homes should be simple but healthful. They do advocate as close relation to the people as possible. But the missionaries cannot live on the level either of the lowest or of the highest native life. The former is physically, and the latter economically, impossible. And today there are already some native Christian teachers and preachers who receive higher salaries than foreign missionaries.

Any fair and adequate comparison of Protestant and Roman Catholic missionaries in this and in other respects would be impracticable here. But it is not true

that all Roman Catholic missionaries in China remained at their stations and all the Protestants left. It is of interest to note, that the critic in the August "Atlantic" sets the Roman Catholic missionaries above the Protestant, not only for frugality of living, but also for their aloofness from the new movements of national and social life in China. He and the Pope appear to be at variance on the subject. The Pope issued, on August 3, 1928, a message of sympathy and approval with the nationalist movement and government, and urged the Roman Catholic missionaries in China to promote the aspirations and rights of the Chinese:

"His Holiness recommends the Bishops as a complement to their work of evangelization, to organize and develop Catholic action in order that the Catholic faithful of both sexes, and especially the dear youth, may with prayer and good works contribute toward the peace, social well-being and greatness of their country in spreading the sacred and salutary principles of the Gospel and in helping the Bishops and clergy to disseminate Christianity and the individual and social benefits of Christian charity." [New York Times, Aug. 4, 1928.]

Lastly, foreign missions are criticized today for their reluctance to accord freedom to the national Churches. A writer in "The Outlook" of February 10, 1926, expressed this view:

"The tide of nationalism in China and India is now rising to the level of that of Japan. The inability of the foreign church boards and their representatives in Japan to reckon with the new Japanese nationalism during the final quarter of the last century set back the progress of Christianity and possibly prevented Japan from being the first nation of the Orient to take this oriental religion back to

an oriental habitat and make it the mighty national saviour. It might still be, were not the principles of Jesus so often flouted by Christian statesmen and legislatures, ignored by business, and jettisoned by our mass wars.

"This is the hour of greatest peril to Christianity in China, and of the greatest hope. Peril if we continue foreign control over any part of it, any of its personnel, its finance or its policies. We must set Christianity free. A new proclamation of emancipation. The national mind of China and India, as of Japan, spurns a foreign-controlled religion. Foreign-controlled institutions cannot hope to hold the allegiance of eastern peoples."

Now, it is worth recalling that it was Neesima who blocked the proposal for one Church in Japan which might have taken over the enterprise with the co-operation of the Churches abroad, and it is worth observing also that far deeper and graver issues were moving than could have been altered by any missionary policy. And it is worth declaring plainly that no missionary policy antagonizes the freedom of the national churches and of Christianity in any of these lands. On the contrary, missions and mission boards have striven and are striving almost to despair to get the churches to stand forth free and self-controlled, assuming and fulfilling their own responsibility.

The problem is one not of emotion, but of reality. Freedom is not a donation which can be given to a church. It is an achievement which only the church can attain. And missions and boards are, or ought to be—and to the extent that they are not they are justly open to criticism—ready and eager to transfer authority and responsibility and to recognize them as true elements and characteristics, to be longed for and welcomed in the churches of the mission field. But here

again criticism wants to have its cake and eat it. It wants responsibility and power transferred, but it wants also " adequate accounting for results, proper and businesslike procedure." But we cannot recognize the freedom and control of the nationals with one gesture and deny it with another. And there is no easy task here—to recognize their responsibility and not default in our own. What we want is the truth in action, a real Christian Church in China and India and everywhere, carrying its own burden, facing its own national task with the best, truest, ablest help we can give, given in the most careful and generous way and under an administration of our trust as competent, efficient, unified, and economical, and as vital, personal, and spiritual, as can be in the hands of such poor folk as we.

XVI

RETURNING TO JESUS

IN the second chapter of the Gospel according to Luke there is presented the only authentic story of the boyhood of Jesus. Indeed, it is the only incident recorded of His life from His infancy to the beginning of His public ministry. Joseph and Mary had made their annual journey to Jerusalem at the Passover. It was the twelfth visit since that memorable year when the miracle of Jesus had come to them at Bethlehem. The Passover was ended and they were on their homeward way to Nazareth. The caravan with which they travelled had come out early from Jerusalem, and four miles on the way had taken the right turning toward Damascus and the north, on the old Roman road which can still be clearly seen where it divides in the narrow plain, on the right the north road for Samaria and Galilee, and on the left the west road for Antipatris and Cæsarea. That west turning is almost certainly the very road over which a little later Paul was taken on the first stage of his long journey to Rome. On the north road, at the end of the first day's journey from Jerusalem, the Galilee caravans stopped for the night at the little village now called Bireh, the ancient Beeroth.

In the movement of the first day's travel of an oriental caravan, made up of many groups of folk and of the long line of camels and asses, moving in only half regulated disorder, the boys would be naturally running

about in their boy tasks and boy fellowships, and no one missed Jesus until the families gathered around the fires in and about the old khan for the evening meal and the night's rest. Only then was it noted that Jesus was not among them. They " supposed him to have been in the company." I presume this can happen still, that Jesus may be missing and through our suppositions or preoccupations we may not be aware of His absence. But there will be no true and complete family gathering in the evening without Him. No, nor at any other time, and if He is not present the sooner we note His absence the better. Memorable will the moment of that discovery be. A thousand years ago the loving memory of the Christian Church marked the historic spot in Beeroth. The ruins of a large Church of the Holy Family are still visible in the village. It was finished in 1146 on the site of a much older church built on the traditional place where Joseph and Mary made their discovery and whence without delay, we infer, they retraced their steps through the night and " returned back again to Jerusalem, seeking Jesus." And they found Him there.

This is the beautiful ancient story. A company of men and women from all lands and all races repeated it in their own experience in the meeting in Jerusalem, on March 24 to April 8, 1928, of the International Missionary Council. This Council is made up of representatives of the foreign missionary agencies of the older Christian Churches, together with representatives of the new Churches which have grown up in ever increasing strength and maturity as the fruitage of the foreign missionary undertaking. Two hundred and forty of us, of whom more than a third were from the churches of Asia and Africa and Latin America, spent these two weeks together on the Mount of Olives, looking east-

ward over the wilderness of Judea and the Dead Sea and the Jordan to Nebo and the mountains of Moab and Gilead, and looking down westward on the garden of Gethsemane and its olive trees, whose little grey leaves were so kind to Jesus, and beyond the valley of Kedron over the Holy City, the area of the Temple where He taught, the pools of Bethesda and Siloam, the sites of the ancient palaces and the Judgment Hall, the hill of Calvary where stood His cross, and the garden with the empty grave from which He rose. We had returned to Jerusalem, seeking Jesus. He is the sole reason for the missionary enterprise, and some of us had feared that here and there throughout the world His Church might be thinking to travel forth in the work of foreign missions with Jesus missing from the company. But every such fear vanished as from all the Churches, the oldest and the newest, rose one single voice of faith and loyalty with regard to our Lord Jesus Christ. No one in this Jerusalem Council had any other Gospel than Christ's Gospel, nor was seeking any other. Every one saw in Him, and in Him alone, the hope and salvation of the world. There was the richness and freedom of the truth. Love cast out fear—the fear and suspicion of other men's fidelity, the fear of the truth we have not seen ourselves and which has been given to another for us, the fear of the fulness which is to gather in all the treasures of humanity; for " the nations of them which are saved shall walk in the light of it and the kings of the earth do bring their glory and honour into it. And the gates of it shall not be shut at all. And they shall bring the glory and honour of the nations into it."

So, the missionary enterprise returned again to Jerusalem where it began, seeking Jesus, and it found Him there, and it bore its witness in clear words, to which I

shall presently refer. I pray that never shall we who are responsible in the Church for the work of foreign missions, or for any of the other work of the Church, lose Christ out of our company or out of His place in our company, or be so busy with the work of the caravan or its idle talk as to forget Him or to be content with only supposing that He is with us, who alone is the light of all our seeing, the Lord of all our action, the meaning and end of all our life.

Let us, too, turn again to Jerusalem, seeking Jesus. There are two aspects in which the conception is inadequate and even untrue, and then one in which it is the very truth and life of which each Church and the whole Christian Church stand in deepest need today and all days.

The conception is inadequate and even untrue if we think that we have to go back to Jerusalem to find Jesus. It is indeed the privilege of a lifetime to do that. I have, for all the forty years of my association with the missionary cause, longed to visit Palestine. I have seen almost all other lands, but only now at last have I seen the Holy Land. I do not wonder that in the language of the East no one says " Jerusalem," but all say " El Kuds," " The Holy." The pilgrim instinct is deep and indestructible in us. To walk where Jesus walked and see the scenes which He saw and loved and which saw and loved Him, to pray in the garden where He prayed, to listen where He listened for the voice of One whom He called, " My Father and your Father," to watch the sun set and the moon rise on Galilee and to see the fishing boats come in with the fruit of the night's labour in the early morning, to stand on the pavement where He stood, the Judge of His judges, and by the place of His Cross of shame and by the grave of His glorious Resur-

rection—who of us has not felt these longings? It is true indeed that we do not seem to find them in St. Paul, who loved the Saviour as no man has ever loved Him more. F. W. H. Myers boldly puts the longing into St. Paul's heart in one of the noblest poems in our tongue:

"Oh to have seen Thee through the vineyards wander,
Pluck the ripe ears and into evening roam,
Followed and known that in the twilight yonder,
Legions of angels watched about Thy Home."

There is no evidence that St. Paul thought such thoughts. But we think them, and they cannot be wrong, for they exalt our Saviour and make the place of His Presence more calm and holy in our hearts. Forevermore unshared in speech and untouched by the form of words, the tender, loving memories of Jesus' country abide with those who in penitent and reverent love have turned thither, seeking Jesus.

But, after all, Paul was right, for only a few can ever return to Palestine. And Christianity, unlike other faiths, has wisely omitted the idea of an earthly pilgrimage. We do not need to go anywhere to find Jesus. As He Himself said by the side of that immortal well when He talked with a woman and made her and no man the occasion of such noblest truth, "No place is necessary, neither this mountain, nor Jerusalem. The hour cometh and now is when the true worshippers shall worship in spirit and in truth." We do not need to return to Jerusalem, seeking Jesus, eight thousand miles and nineteen hundred years away. "And he said, How is it that ye sought me? Knew ye not that I must be about my Father's business?" We can seek and find Him there today. He is waiting for us in His Father's business. The warrant is deep and true for our longing

to know all we can about His Incarnate life on earth and the land which He consecrated forever, but it is not the Jesus of Palestine alone we know. It is the everlasting Son of the Father, the Saviour who is accessible to us and close by our side, behind the plow or the machine or the ledger or the desk or the sewing-basket, on every acre of our American farms, in every street of our American cities, every room of our homes and every experience and necessity of our American life. This was St. Paul's view. He lifted up in his own life and for all human life the ever living, everywhere available Christ. As Somerville says in "St. Paul's Conception of Christ"—"The past circumstances of the earthly Jesus have comparatively little interest for Paul, now that, as exalted, Christ has entered on a present activity in the hearts of men, in which He re-enacts in their experience what was most vital in His historical career and repeats in them all that was most distinctive of His own divine life." And Dr. Denney, in a great passage in his exposition of II Corinthians, sets forth boldly what he calls "one of the most prominent and enviable characteristics of the New Testament religious life." "Christ," he says, "is on His throne and His people are exalted and victorious in Him. When we forget Christ's exaltation in our study of His earthly life—when we are so preoccupied, nay even so fascinated, with what He was, that we forget what He is—when, in other words, a pious historical imagination takes the place of a living religious faith—that victorious consciousness is lost, and in a most essential point the image of the Lord is not reproduced in the believer. This is why the Pauline point of view—if indeed it is to be called Pauline and not simply Christian—is essential. Christianity is a religion, not merely a history,

though it should be the history told by Matthew, Mark and Luke; and the chance of having the history itself appreciated for religion is that He who is its subject shall be contemplated, not in the dim distance of the past, but in the glory of His heavenly reign, and that He shall be recognized not merely as one who lived a perfect life in His own generation, but as the giver of life eternal by His spirit to all who turn to Him. The Church will always be justified, while recognizing that Christianity is a historical religion, in giving prominence not to its historicity, but to what makes it a religion at all—namely, the present exaltation of Christ. This involves everything and determines, as St. Paul tells us, the very form and spirit of her own life."

There is a second sense in which the conception of returning to Jerusalem to find Jesus is inadequate and untrue. It is inadequate and untrue if it is a proposal to go back of John's Gospel and Paul's Epistles and to eliminate the miracle and mystery from the Synoptic Gospels and to reduce Jesus to the naturalistic figure of a good man who taught nobly but was self-deceived, and around whom delusion soon grew up which transformed the simple, human teacher of Galilee into a supernatural Saviour and a dying God. This is not returning to Jerusalem to find Jesus. It is returning to lose Him. If we do not need to go anywhere to find the true Jesus still less do we need to go anywhere afar to find the false one. There are countless places where such an unreal Jesus can be found in our modern thought today—where men measure life and duty by what they themselves are rather than by what they are not, but what God is, where human failure hides itself from itself by unconsciousness of the purity that is pure light, where the human spirit, unlike Christ, sets

something else than the child in the midst of life and judgment, where the mass of things made hides for men the mind and hand of the Maker, where movement can be conceived as self-moved and not as the motion of a Mover, where mystery fades from men's thoughts and the wonder of life as given is lost in the familiarity of the gift—in these common places of our modern world, the real Jesus of history, the only Jesus there is, is lost and there is substituted for Him a fiction for which there is no warrant in the actual records and which leaves the history of the origin and nature of Christianity an unexplained and inexplicable enigma. And yet this is what a great deal of our modern education is offering us in its return to Jerusalem, seeking Jesus. But this type of education represents a view of life and of the world fundamentally defective and untrue. It loses the ultimate fact of reality, the fact namely that the reality of life includes the mystery of life transcending our understanding of life. One of our most modest but most original and veracious naturalists recently said all this in a striking article in which in the simplest and yet most conclusive way he took the theory of mechanism minus mystery and broke it on the knees of a bee. " For my part," he wrote, " I cannot contemplate a wasp, a spider, or a bee without being confronted with absolute Mystery. At the end of every telescope, beneath every microscope, at the bottom of every marl pit, is Mystery pure and simple. Science reveals more for me to wonder at, but solves nothing. This may not be religion exactly," he goes on modestly, " but it is a continual reminder of my own position in the universe. And so I think," his honest mind concludes, " that a system of education which takes the attitude of accounting for all things or being

just upon the point of accounting for them when the scientists have discovered just a few more facts, is not education at all. It stops just short of the truth, and therefore it is not exactly honest." This is not a warrant for credulity, but it is a justification of our refusal to subtract from the Gospel the supernatural mystery which alone explains it and which is its glory and truth and joy. The Jesus we return to Jerusalem to find is the full Jesus of the New Testament, of Matthew and Mark and Luke, of John and Peter and Paul. No man can take Him away from us. We come back to Jerusalem and to the records of the New Testament, and there He is, the full, authentic, familiar figure. The ablest of the critics tells us so, though we do not need his word. We are glad of it, but we do not require it, for, as John has assured us, " the anointing which we have received of him abideth in us, and we need not that any man teach us: but as the same anointing teacheth us of all things and is true and is no lie, and even as it hath taught us we shall abide in him." "And we know that the Son of God is come and hath given us an understanding that we may know him that is true, and we are in him that is true, even in His Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God and eternal life." As we turn again to Jerusalem we find there this Jesus, and no other.

But do we truly find there this Jesus? That question brings us to the central need of our day and our life, of our own Church and of the whole Church. We must return to Jerusalem to Jesus, to the full Jesus—to Jesus coming from Bethlehem of Judea and from Galilee of the Gentiles, to the Jesus of the three Jerusalems, of the Holy City on its hills in the little land between Jordan and the Sea; of Mount Sion, the city of the living

God, the heavenly Jerusalem, with its innumerable company of angels and the general assembly of the first born; and of the New Jerusalem which is to descend from God out of heaven upon a new earth full of righteousness and docile at last to its true King and Emperor.

All this, however, is too much and too great for us, and I propose simply four aspects in which we need to return to Jerusalem to Jesus. We shall find even in this far more than we shall be equal to.

First we need to return to the simplicity of Christ. This is one of Paul's few references to the great elemental intellectual, moral and spiritual qualities of Jesus. It is amazing that Paul alludes so little to the character of Christ. His Epistles are full of moral appeal. After every one of his great theological flights he comes close home to the ethical issues of men's lives in their human temptations and relationships, and to the social problems which they faced, and appeals for the highest Christian life and character. One would suppose that his most powerful ground of appeal would be some reference to Jesus and the flawless beauty and power of His life. On the contrary, such appeal is almost wholly lacking. Of the few instances of it, all the more significant because of their rarity, one is this reference to the simplicity that is in Christ: "But I fear, lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve in his craftiness, your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity and the purity that is toward Christ." Even here he has in mind not only the quality of Jesus' earthly life, but an eternal aspect of His Spirit and nature. All the more, then, we need to return to it and lay hold upon it.

One of our great difficulties always is awe of great-

ness, of bulk, of power. We exalt what is complex and massive and organized. And we set out in every enterprise to enlist influence and wealth. Often the paper or the prophet which deplores such trust, illustrates it. We need to rise to freedom by returning to the simplicity of Jesus and unlearning this reliance upon the great. How good and simple and small the life of Jesus was. It was lived in one of the smallest countries in the world. It is forty miles from the Jordan to the Mediterranean, and ninety from Jerusalem to Nazareth. Apparently only once did He venture out of His own country, into the coasts of Tyre and Sidon. And only a score of towns and villages where He went are mentioned in the Gospels. The scale of time, too, is especially slight and simple. All the distinct events and teaching recorded in the Gospels took place, it is said, in less than seventy days of time. Rightly do we sing of His birth, "How silently, how silently, The wondrous gift is given!" and of that night as the "holy night, silent night." The quiet world welcomed quietly the simplicity of the Incarnation, God coming not as an army, but as a little child.

No doubt William James put the truth extremely in his often quoted letter to Mrs. Henry Whitman, which is better known perhaps than all his psychology and philosophy:

"As for me, my bed is made. I am against bigness and greatness in all their forms, and with the invisible molecular moral forces that work from individual to individual, stealing in through the crannies of the world like so many soft rootlets, or like the capillary oozing of water, and yet rending the hardest monuments of man's pride, if you give them time. The bigger the unit you deal with, the hollower, the more brutal, the more mendacious is the life displayed.

So I am against all big organizations as such, national ones first and foremost; against all big successes or big results: and in favour of the eternal forces of truth which always work in the individual and immediately unsuccessful way, under-dogs always, till history comes, after they are long dead, and puts them on top."

No doubt this is extreme. The same God who made the flowers made the mountains and the seas and the stars. And all greatness is to be consecrated to Him with all weakness. But all greatness is littleness to God, and all weakness is strength, and we shall do well to follow more bravely and completely the simplicity of Jesus. "For the first time in history," to quote the noble words of my friend, Principal Cairns, "there appeared on earth One who absolutely trusted the Unseen, who had utter confidence that Love was at the heart of all things, utter confidence also in the absolute Power of that absolute Love and in the Liberty of that Love to help Him." This was the simple principle of Christ. He said not a word to Pilate, who might have released Him, and called not once on the legions of angels, girded with angelic sword, which waited His bidding, but quietly and alone endured His cross and redeemed mankind, and silently and alone rent the bars of death and hell and rose the Triumphant Conqueror.

And not in action only but in thought also we need to return to the simplicity of Christ. It is our right and duty to think as far as we can into the revelation of God in Christ and into the nature of God and of God's mind and God's world. But we need to remember always that only one thing is needful, and "Mary hath chosen that good part." "Thou, O Christ, art all I want. More than all in Thee I find." Jesus only is the fundamental and adequate theology. What was enough

for Peter and James and John, when Jesus was transfigured before them, is enough for us. Christ, and Christ alone, is the sufficient essential and the essential sufficiency. He is our only and our deepest need. All the buildings of Palestine suffice only to cumber and conceal. The spirit strips them away to see once again under the blue sky Jesus talking with the woman by Jacob's well, Jesus kneeling beneath the olive trees in Gethsemane, Jesus standing before the governor, Jesus hanging upon His cross, Jesus risen from the empty grave.

And Jesus is the one bond of union. No agreements will hold us together without Him—no common fears, no combinations, no organizations. And He alone will hold all men across the lines of race and nation and sex and condition, Jew and Gentile, Greek and Barbarian, Roman and Scythian, black and white, rich and poor, bond and free, male and female. Christ can unite them, and Christ only, and only Christ. A fortnight after leaving the Jerusalem Council, I sat in the reception room of the Greek Orthodox bishop of Aleppo, and he asked us of the Missionary Council Meeting in Jerusalem and of the Conference on Faith and Order at Lausanne. I told him of each. "And did the Churches which were one in their missionary purpose in Jerusalem find a way to unite at Lausanne?" asked he. I explained that they accepted the two great creeds—the Apostles' and the Nicene, and the two Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, but that some wanted the decrees also of the other Councils and seven Sacraments instead of two, and that wise and good men would deliberate further on these things. "Yes, yes," said he, "the philosophers will debate over it for centuries, but only Christ is necessary, and we may all unite now in Him alone." Yes, but that would be to return

to the simplicity of Jesus. And why should we not return? I am writing these words on a ship in the Mediterranean, a British boat homecoming from the furthest seas. Over my head in the stained glass of the writing-room is the motto of the company "Quis Separabit?" Who will separate? No one, please God.

"Around our hearts there closely twine
Those ties which naught can sever;
For I am His, and He is mine
For ever and for ever."

And if each of us is in Him, we are each in one another and members one of another in His indivisible body in the pure simplicity of Christ.

In the second place, let us return to the gentleness and love of Christ. This was St. Paul's appeal: "Now I Paul myself beseech you by the meekness and gentleness of Christ." If any one thinks this is a counsel of weakness, the exaltation of timidity, then he never met that forewhisper of the Eternal Judgment, the terrible meek, or understood the words of the Shepherd King, "Thy gentleness hath made me great." There is no weakness in love. All the strength of the strong, all the violence of the warrior on whatever battlefield of action or of opinion, are frailty and feebleness compared with love, the weak mother's love, the love of the Strong Son of God who as a Lamb took away the sins of the world.

How easy it is for every one of us to forget all this and to seek to defend or exalt Christ with a temper so different from His! Two things should make us pause. One is the suspicion lest our zeal deceive itself and us.

"Who lights the fagot?
Not the full faith, but the lurking doubt."

As Christ well knew, there were inner goads pricking Paul before that blinding illumination on the Damascus road. All that fierce zeal hid a misgiving in Paul and was his unconscious way of repressing it or making compromise with himself over it. One asks himself in moments of deep contention and concern, "Is my zeal for God alone, and for the truth of God alone? Or is anything else mixed with it? If it is pure, why not return and rest in the meekness and gentleness of Christ, remembering the great and ancient word, 'In returning and rest shall ye be saved; in quietness and confidence shall be your strength.' Return, my soul, to Jerusalem and Jesus."

For this, secondly, is the great thing that should move us. Jesus was gentle and meek and loving. And, as John so faithfully reminds us, "He that saith he abideth in him ought himself also to walk even as he walked." It will not do for us to call Jesus Master and Lord unless we mean honestly and lovingly to follow Him and to try to be like Him. No words of His are more unmistakably plain than those which He spoke about this. "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father who is in heaven. Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, did we not prophesy by thy name and by thy name cast out demons, and by thy name do many mighty works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity." These are searching and searing words. Prophecy in Christ's name and in that name the casting out of devils and the doing of many wonderful works are called iniquity! Where, then, may we hope to stand? Nowhere, any of us—our self-righteousness is no righteousness at all—

but only in the mercy and grace of Christ, the meek and gentle Christ. Oh, let us try by His grace and help to be more like Him, more patient and considerate, more thoughtful and generous, more tender and kind in little things. The great God Himself is kind. When Paul would describe the majesty and glory of the Incarnation he can do it no better than to say, " The kindness and love of God our Saviour toward man appeared." If only that kindness and love might shine through us, what would it not do? Our dear Lord knew what it would do. "A new commandment I give unto you, That ye love one another, even as I have loved you, that ye also love one another. By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another."

But this simple, meek and gentle Jesus is also the Lord of all being, by whom God made the worlds, and our absolute Lord and Master. "All authority," said He, " hath been given unto me in heaven and on earth."

We need, in the third place, to return to Jerusalem to the absolute and complete authority of Jesus. " Ye call me Master and Lord," said He, " for so I am."

The New Testament knows no limit to the authority of Christ. It uses five different Greek words, all of which are translated by the one word Master in our English translation of the Bible, and each of these words has a different significance. We need to go back to them and to accept unreservedly the full Mastery of Christ which they involve. The first of these words is the simple word " Teacher." It is used in the original in the passage which reads in our Bibles, " They said unto him, Rabbi (which is to say, being interpreted, Master), where dwellest thou." And Mary used it in its Hebrew form in that hour of glorious reassurance at

the open grave when Jesus said to her, "Mary," and she turned herself and saith unto Him, Rabboni, which, as John explains, "is to say, Master." The second word means literally "Leader," and it is used in a passage full of meaning for us and our spirit in all our organized and administrative church life, "Neither be ye called masters (*i. e.*, Leaders), for one is your master (*i. e.*, Leader) even Christ. But he that is greatest among you shall be your servant." The third word means literally superintendent or overseer, the one who directs and whose word of direction is authoritative and absolute. It is the word used in Luke's Gospel: "Master, we have toiled all night and taken nothing, nevertheless, at thy word we will let down the nets," with the sure and rich result that follows obedience. "Master, carest thou not that we perish?" and "Master, we saw one casting out devils in thy name and we forbade him, for he followed not with us." On these last two occasions Jesus rebuked His disciples for conduct discordant with the title by which they called Him. His mastery meant trust and not fear, unity and not disunion. Those who called Him Master in any sense must accept the authority and meaning of His Mastery. The fourth word is the most familiar and frequent of all, the word which is usually translated "Lord," but which in our King James Version is rightly translated Master, also—as in our Lord's word in the Sermon on the Mount about the inevitableness and exclusiveness of our moral self-alignments, "No man can serve two masters, for either he will hate the one and love the other, or else he will hold to one and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon." There are no double loyalties for Christians. And the fifth word which our New Testament translates Master is the most striking of all. It is

the Greek word "despotes," and I suppose our best equivalent for it would be "emperor." Let us translate it so in the three passages where it occurs. "There are certain men," writes Jude, "who deny the very Lord God and our Emperor Jesus Christ." "There were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, denying even the Emperor that bought them," said Peter. "But," declares Paul, "if a man purge himself from these (*i. e.*, from earthliness and dishonour) he shall be a vessel unto honour, sanctified and meet for the Emperor's use."

What a rich and joyful recognition we have in the New Testament of this unlimited and all-comprehending authority of Jesus! Men brought themselves and all that they had and all that they were and all that they might ever hope for to their only Lord and Master, and laid all at His feet. In this regard supremely let us return to Jerusalem and Jesus today. Let us do it in the Church and behold what conviction we shall work among men as they see our love and order and will desire a part in such a fellowship of brotherly love and dutiful obedience. Let us do it and behold the result in the abundant streams of adequate resources for all the work of the Church at home and abroad. Let us do it and feel again the holy jubilant life and power of our unity in that great Head "from which all the body by joints and bands having nourishment ministered, and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God."

We speak utterly without restraint or qualification in this matter. We know no limitation whatever upon the authority of Christ; His word, His mind, His spirit, His lordship are absolute and unconditioned. We are to bring every thought and action, all our attitudes and relationships in individual life, in our homes and in the

Church into the obedience of Christ. All industry and legislation, economics and politics, the nation in itself and in all its relationships, races and racial relationships, art and literature and education, work and play, and all that there is or can be of life are to be brought under Christ's Lordship. We do not say that they are to be brought under the Church. We say quite otherwise. But we say that they are to be brought under Christ that He may be Head over all, the King of all them that reign as kings, the Lord of all lords. That is our faith and conviction.

"All hail the power of Jesus' name!
Let angels prostrate fall.
Bring forth the royal diadem,
And crown Him Lord of all,
Crown Him, crown Him, crown Him Lord of all."

And lastly we go back to Jerusalem to Jesus, to the finality and universality of Jesus. Perhaps you will say that that is what we have just been speaking about. It is truly so, but let us say it again, and say more, if we can. There is nothing good or great that we will not say about Jesus. There is no claim that we will not make for Him. There is naught that we can say about God that we will not say also about Jesus, " the Son of his love; in whom we have our redemption, the forgiveness of our sins: who is the image of the invisible God, the first born of all creation; for in him were all things created, in the heavens and upon the earth, things visible and things invisible, whether thrones or dominions or principalities or powers; all things have been created through him, and unto him; and he is before all things, and in him all things consist. And he is the head of the body the Church: who is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead; that in all things he might have the pre-

eminence. For it was the good pleasure of the Father that in him should all the fulness dwell; and through him to reconcile all things unto himself, having made peace through the blood of his cross; through him, I say, whether things upon the earth, or things in the heavens."

We will say about Jesus all that all the creeds have said, and then we will say that He is more than this. All that men have said or ever can say about His glory, His beauty, His power, His deity we will say. He is all this and He transcends all this. Here let us stand each for himself and all of us as Christ's Church, and henceforth let no man trouble us, for we bear in our mind and in our heart, in our spirit and in our body the marks of the Lord Jesus.

There are men today, of honest and scrupulous minds, who hesitate to use such language as we have used. They are eagerly ready to speak of the universality of Jesus. But they hesitate to speak of His uniqueness. They will say "centrality," but pause at "finality." One of these, in a recent and able book on "The Nature and Right of Religion," writes:

"We must suppose that the significance of Jesus is not different in kind but only in degree from that of other personalities through whom God has acted in a revealing and saving way. Traditional theology is governed by the reverse assumption. Jesus is represented as doing what none other could even in part do. He divinized our human nature, paid the penalty our sin entailed, and revealed the Father in virtue of a superhuman knowledge belonging to Him as the eternal Son. He sent from heaven the gift of the Holy Spirit, and He intercedes for us before God. But it is easy to see that this resort to unique categories inevitably involves a descent from the moral standpoint to one

that is physical, legal, or mythological. And so far from glorifying Jesus, it casts over Him the shadow of unreality."

We hold this "traditional theology," and we do not feel these hesitations. Indeed, the very author of these words cannot remain beneath them. Within three pages he himself writes:

"Jesus is not only touched with the Divine, as many are; He is all Divine. The Divine constitutes the whole content of His human life. And therefore it is that Jesus makes upon us a unique impression, the impression that in Him, as in none other, God has come to us, to disclose to us His inmost heart, to condemn our sin, to call us to His service, and to create within us the life that is life indeed."

But all words fall short of the reality with regard to Christ. If He were nothing but a good dead man who spoke and wrought as wisely as He knew long ago in Palestine, who died bravely on a Cross with no hate of those who did such hateful wrong, and over whose undisturbed grave the Syrian stars look down, then we should have much scruple lest we should wrong His memory with excess speech. Indeed, long ago we should have found the adequate words to describe His humanity. But to us Jesus Christ is not a good dead man, but God, the living God, our Risen and Living Saviour, and we will use all the language we have, and deem it simple and poor to utter the wonder that is beyond all utterance.

Nevertheless, we can make our confession. We confess Him in the august symbols of our historic creeds and confessions, and when in 1928 we turned again to Jerusalem from all peoples and lands, seeking Jesus, we confessed Him again. I promised to refer to this confession, and I cannot better close these discussions of living issues than by quoting from the Message

which the Jerusalem Council adopted without dissenting voice:

"Our message is Jesus Christ. He is the revelation of what God is and of what Man through Him may become. In Him we come face to face with the Ultimate Reality of the universe; He makes known to us God as our Father, perfect and infinite in love and in righteousness; for in Him we find God incarnate, the final, yet ever unfolding, revelation of the God in whom we live and move and have our being.

"We hold that through all that happens, in light and in darkness, God is working, ruling and overruling. Jesus Christ, in His life and through His death and Resurrection, has disclosed to us the Father, the Supreme Reality, as almighty Love, reconciling the world to Himself by the Cross, suffering with men in their struggle against sin and evil, bearing with them the burden of sin, forgiving them as they, with forgiveness in their own hearts, turn to Him.

"The vision of God in Christ brings and deepens the sense of sin and guilt. We are not worthy of His love; we have by our own fault opposed His holy will. Yet that same vision which brings the sense of guilt brings also the assurance of pardon, if only we yield ourselves in faith to the Spirit of Christ so that His redeeming love may avail to reconcile us to God.

"We reaffirm that God, as Jesus Christ has revealed Him, requires all His children, under all circumstances, at all times, and in all human relationships, to live in love and righteousness for His glory. By the Resurrection of Christ and the gift of the Holy Spirit He offers His own power to men that they may be fellow-workers with Him, and urges them on to a life of adventure and self-sacrifice in preparation for the coming of His Kingdom in its fulness."

Then follows the great affirmation adopted, also without dissent, by the World Conference on Faith and Order, at Lausanne, beginning:

"The message of the Church to the world is and must always remain the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

"The Gospel is the joyful message of redemption both here and hereafter, the gift of God to sinful man in Jesus Christ."

After the full affirmation of Lausanne the Jerusalem Message follows with the central and essential missionary motive:

"Our true and compelling motive lies in the very nature of the God to whom we have given our hearts. Since He is love, His very nature is to share. Christ is the expression in time of the eternal self-giving of the Father. Coming into fellowship with Christ, we find in ourselves an overmastering impulse to share Him with others. We are constrained by the love of Christ and by obedience to His last command. He Himself said, 'I am come that ye might have life, and have it more abundantly,' and our experience corroborates it. He has become life to us. We would share that life.

"We are assured that Christ comes with an offer of life to men and to societies and to nations. We believe that in Him the shackles of moral evil and guilt are broken from human personality and that men are made free, and that such personal freedom lies at the basis of the freeing of society from cramping custom and blighting social practices and political bondage, so that in Christ men and societies and nations may stand up free and complete.

"We find in Christ, and especially in His Cross and Resurrection, an inexhaustible source of power that makes us hope when there is no hope. We believe that through it men and societies and nations that have lost their moral nerve will be quickened into life.

"We have a pattern in our minds as to what form that life should take. We believe in a Christ-like world. We know nothing better, we can be content with nothing less. We do not go to the nations, called non-Christian, because they are the worst of the world and they alone are in

need—we go because they are a part of the world and share with us in the same human need—the need of redemption from ourselves and from sin, the need to have life complete and abundant and to be re-made after the pattern of Christ-likeness. We desire a world in which Christ will not be crucified, but where His Spirit shall reign.

"We believe that men are made for Christ and cannot really live apart from Him. Our fathers were impressed with the horror that men should die without Christ—we share that horror, we are impressed also with the other horror that men should live without Christ.

"Herein lies the Christian motive. It is simple: We cannot live without Christ and we cannot bear to think of men living without Him. We cannot be content to live in a world that is un-Christlike. We cannot be idle while the yearning of His heart for His brethren is unsatisfied.

"Since Christ is the motive, the end of Christian missions fits in with that motive. Its end is nothing less than the production of Christlike character, in individuals and societies and nations through faith in and fellowship with Christ the living Saviour, and through corporate sharing of life in a divine society.

"Christ is our motive and Christ is our end. We must give nothing less, and we can give nothing more."

I have not hesitated to quote so fully, as one who had a glad share in the responsibility of this message, and I can only complete this appeal for a return to Jerusalem and to Jesus with the closing words of the Jerusalem Council's deliverance with the prayer that they may come to express the experience of the Christian Church:

"In our conference together we have seen more clearly the fulness and sufficiency of the Gospel and our own need of the salvation of Christ. The enlarging thoughts of the generations find the Gospel and the Saviour ever richer and greater than men had known.

"This deepened assurance of the adequacy and universality of the Gospel, however, is not enough. More effective ways must be found for its proclamation, not to systems of opinion only, but to human beings, to men and women for whom Christ died. The most thorough and convincing intellectual statement of Christianity is necessary, but such statements cannot suffice. The Gospel must be expressed also in simplicity and love, and offered to men's hearts and minds by word and deed and life, by righteousness and loving kindness, by justice, sympathy and compassion, by ministry to human needs and the deep want of the world.

"As together, Christians of all lands, we have surveyed the world and the needs of men, we are convinced of the urgent necessity for a great increase in the Christian forces in all countries, and for a still fuller measure of co-operation between the churches of all nations in more speedily laying the claim of Christ upon all the unoccupied areas of the world and of human life.

"We are persuaded that we and all Christian people must seek a more heroic practice of the Gospel. It cannot be that our present complacency and moderation are a faithful expression of the mind of Christ, and of the meaning of His Cross and Resurrection in the midst of the wrong and want and sin of our modern world. As we contemplate the work with which Christ has charged His Church, we who are met here on the Mount of Olives, in sight of Calvary, would take up for ourselves and summon those from whom we come, and to whom we return, to take up with us the Cross of Christ, and all that for which it stands, and to go forth into the world to live in the fellowship of His sufferings and by the power of His Resurrection in hope and expectation of His glorious Kingdom."

May this modern summons from that far off holy place and that far off holy time when from Beeroth, where the Passover caravan homeward bound for Galilee lodged for the night, Joseph and Mary returned

again to Jerusalem, seeking Jesus, speak clear and full to our hearts today.

Nay more, by the Eternal Spirit may we hear today as John heard, and in the praise of Christ join with him and with those to whose witness he listened from heaven:

"And I heard a loud voice saying in heaven, Now is come salvation and strength and the Kingdom of our God and the power of His Christ." "And they sing a new song, saying, Worthy art thou to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain, and didst purchase unto God with thy blood men of every tribe, and tongue, and people, and nation, and madest them to be unto our God a kingdom and priests; and they reign upon the earth."

"And I saw, and I heard a voice of many angels round about the throne and the living creatures and the elders; and the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands; saying with a loud voice, Worthy is the Lamb that hath been slain to receive the power, and riches, and wisdom, and might and honour, and glory, and blessing.

"And every created thing which is in the heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and on the sea, and all things that are in them, heard I saying, Unto Him that sitteth on the throne, and unto the Lamb, be the blessing, and the honour, and the glory, and the dominion, for ever and ever."

This is the Lord Jesus to whom we have turned and in whom by the grace of God we shall abide, and who, thank God, now and forever abides with us.

Is this the truth? Whether it is or not is the greatest and most living of all issues.

INDEX

Aleppo, Bishop of, 264
"Allahabad Pioneer, The," 231
Amir Ali Syed, 12
Anderson, Rufus, 235
Aristides of Athens, 63
Arnold, Julean, "Some Bigger Issues in China's Problems," 228
"Atlantic Monthly, The," 230, 247, 249

Barnett, Canon, 57, 235
Barrows, J. H., 125
Baur, 50
Beeroth, 252
Bennett, Moore, 230
Bible Union of China, 135
Bohme, 50
"Bombay Chronicle," 14
Bonar, Andrew, 165
Bosworth, 165
Boxer Uprising, 233
Briggs, C. A., 61 f., 65 ff.
Brookes, Sydney, 231
Browning, 124
Brownson, Orestes, 219
Buddha, 88
Buffington, Judge Joseph, 73
Bunyan's "Grace Abounding," 119
Bushnell, Horace, 31, 127, 161

Cassells, "Men of the Knotted Heart," 84
Chandavarkar, Sir Narayan, 25 f., 88 f.
Chinese Consortium, 219
"Chinese Dutch Reformed Church," 239
"Christian Century, The," 230
Church Unity, 140, 239
Clark, S. J., 235
Clement, 64
Croly, George, 166
Curzon, 231
Cust, R. N., 232, 235

Darwin, 121 f.
Davison, H. P., 219
Denney, James, 257
Dickinson, Lowes, "Letters from a Chinese Official," 232
Du Bose, "The Soteriology of the New Testament," 65
Duncan, "Rabbi," 55

Ecce Homo, Church of, 72, 105
Edersheim, 41
Expense of Foreign Missions, 240 ff.

Falconer, Ion Keith, 127
Faraday, 106
Farrar, "The Witness of History to Christ," 41
Fisher, George S., 126
Franklin, Benjamin, 153
France, Anatole, 215
Froude, "The Study of History," 53
Foreign Missions—
  Expense of, 240 ff., 248
  Turn-over of force, 244
Forrest, "The Christ of History and Experience," 38 f.

Gandhi, 12 f., 19
"Gantry, Elmer," 127
Gary, Judge, 219
Gibbs, Philip, 215
Gibson, J. C., 235
Gilmour, James, 163, 165
Gladstone, 35, 55
Godet, 49, 85

Gompers, Samuel, 219
Gordon, "Chinese," 162
Gordon, George A., 21 ff.
Grant, A. D., 84

Hallam, 162
Hardy, "The Dynasts," 208
Harnack, 10, 96, 193
Hays, George P., 191, 196
Henderson's "Stonewall Jackson," 162
Hinduism, 12 f.
Hodge, Caspar Wistar, 129
Hoffmann, 50
Holmes, "The Guardian Angel," "Elsie Venner," 111
"The Chambered Nautilus," 129
Holtzmann, 50
Hooker, 122
Hu Shih, 228
Hutton, Richard Holt, 232
Huxley, 157

Ignatius, 63
Indian Mutiny, 233
Indian Testimonies to Christ, 18 f.
International Missionary Council at Jerusalem, 202, 253, 272 ff.
Irenæus, 56, 64

Jackson, "Stonewall," 162
James, William, 262 f.
Johnston, R. F., 232
Jones, A. G., 235
Jones, Mark M., 230
Jones, Stanley, 14, 18
Judson, Adoniram, 137
Justin Martyr, 63

Kelvin, 106
Kelman, John, 115
Kingsley, Charles, 157

Lamb, Charles, 106
Lamont, T. W., 219
Langdon, Davies, 185
Lanier, "The Crystal Christ," "The Marshes of Glynn," 53, 106 f.
Lausanne Conference on Faith and Order, 264, 273 f.
Li Hung Chang, 153
Liddon, Canon, 56
"Liu Shao Yang," 232
Livingstone, David, 133, 163

Madras, Lawyers Club of, 15
Mann, Dr. Matthew D., 115
Mantz, Bishop, 52
Marquis, Don, "The Dark Hours," 75
"Masses," 74
Master, Greek words for, 115, 267 f.
Merrill, William P., 52
Michie, Alexander, 231
Mohammedanism, 11 f., 88 ff.
Moody, D. L., 153
Moravian tombstone, 82
Morgan, "The Nature and Right of Religion," 271 f.
Morley, John, 35, 122, 151
Morschauser, Justice Joseph, 181 f.
Mowgli, 210
Munger, Theodore, 134
Myers, "Saint Paul," 54, 256

Natarajan, 13, 19
Neander, 50
Neesima, 250
Neve, J. L., 137 ff.
Nevius, J. L., 235
Newman, 96
Newton, John, 54
Norman, Henry, 231
North, Frank Mason, 52

Ohio, University of, Semi-Centennial, 216
Origen, 64
"Outlook, The," 249

Pasteur, 106
Phelps, Austin, 158
Phidias, 126
Plato, 53

"Punch" on Livingstone, 133 f.

Randolph, Canon, 64
Robertson, A. T., 178
Rojas, "The Invisible Christ," 103
Roman Catholic Missions, 249
Royden, Maud, 194
Rousseau, 53
Ruskin, 159

Salisbury, Lord, 231
Scudder, Miss Vida, 74
Seeley, Sir John R., 35
Sherman, John, 231
Simpson, Sir Alexander, 86
Sin in modern thought, 24
Smith, Dr. George, 232
Somerville, "St. Paul's Conception of Christ," 257
Sparhawk, John, 126
Stewart, Charles S., 257
Storrs, "The Divine Origin of Christianity," 113 f.
Struthers, J. P., 84, 211

Taiping Rebellion, 233
Tennyson, 54, 162
Tertullian, 64
Thompson, Francis, 110
Thompson, "The Divine Order of Human Society," 222
"Times, The New York," 182, 231
Townsend, Meredith, 232
Trench's Sonnets, 76 f., 160 f.
Tucker, "My Generation," 221

Unamuno, Miguel de, 103

Verbeck, Guido, 235
Virchow, 86
Von Hugel, Baron, 33
Von Müller, Johann, 114

Watterson, Col. Henry, 28
Weed, Thurlow, 211
Westcott, 50
Wilberforce, 96
Williams, John E., 101

Young, "The Christ of History," 41

Zahn, 64

Printed in the United States of America